THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

616915

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

8 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXCVII.

COMPRISING PERIOD FROM TUESDAY, TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1908, TO FRIDAY, FOURTH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1908.

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1908.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_november-24-december-4-1908_197

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1303), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols. Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.: Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41	GEO. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42	GEO. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	...44	GEO. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	...45	—	 1805
— 6 & 7	...46	—	 1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9	...47	GEO. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11	...48	GEO. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	...49	—	 1809
— 15 — 17	...50	—	 1810
— 18 — 20	...51	—	... 1810-11
— 21 — 23	...52	—	 1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26	...53	GEO. III.	... 1812-13
— 27 & 28	...54	—	... 1813-14
— 29 to 31	...55	—	... 1814-15
— 32 — 34	...56	—	 1816
— 35 & 36	...57	—	 1817
— 37 — 38	...58	—	 1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40	...59	GEO. III.	 1819
— 41	60	—	... 1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	... 1	GEO. IV.	 1820
— 4 & 5	... 2	—	 1821
— 6 — 7	... 3	—	 1822
— 8 — 9	... 4	—	 1823
— 10 — 11	... 5	—	 1824
— 12 — 13	... 6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	... 7	—	 1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16	 7	GEO. IV.	 1826
— 17	 8	—	 1827
— 18 & 19	... 9	—	 1828
— 20 — 21	...10	—	 1829
— 22 to 25	...11	—	 1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(NINTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 WILL. IV.......1830-1

(TENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 4 to 8... 2 WILL. IV. 1832
— 9 — 14... 3 — 1831

(ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 15 to 20... 4 WILL. IV....... 1833
— 21 — 25... 5 — 1834

(TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 26 to 30... 6 WILL. IV....... 1835
— 31 — 35... 7 — 1836
— 36 — 38... 8 — 1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 to 44... 1 VICTORIA 1838
— 45 — 50... 2 — 1839
— 51 — 55... 3 — 1840
— 56 — 58... 4 — (a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 59 .... 4 VICTORIA (b) 1841
— 60 to 65... 5 — 1842
— 66 — 71 .. 6 — 1843
— 72 — 76... 7 — 1844
— 77 — 82.. 8 — 1845
— 83 — 88... 9 — 1846
— 89 — 94...10 — (a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 95 ... .10 VICTORIA (b) 1847
— 96 to 101...11 — 1848
— 102 —107...12 — 1849
— 108 —113...13 — 1850
— 114 —118...14 — 1851
— 119 —122...15 — (a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 123 ....15 VICTORIA (b) 1852
— 124 to 129...16 — 1853
— 130 —135...17 — 1854
— 136 —139...18 — 1855
— 140 —143...19 — 1856
— 144 .... 20 — (a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol 145 to 147...20 VICTORIA (b) 1857
— 148 —151 ..21 — 1858
— 152 —153...22 — (a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 154 to 155...22 VICTORIA (b) 1859
— 156 —160...23 — 1860
— 161 —164...24 — 1861
— 165 —168...25 — 1862
— 169 —172...26 — 1863
— 173 —176...27 — 1864
— 177 —180...28 — 1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 181 to 184...29 VICTORIA...... 1866
— 185 —189...30 — 1867
— 190 —193...31 — ... 1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 194 to 198...32 VICTORIA ... 1868-9
— 199 —203...33 — 1870
— 204 —208...34 — 1871
— 209 —213...35 — 1872
— 214 —217...36 — 1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 218 to 221...37 VICTORIA 1874
— 222 —226...38 — 1875
— 227 —231...39 — 1876
— 232 —236...40 — 1877
— 237 —242...41 — 1878
— 243 —249...42 — ... 1878-9
— 250 & 251...43 — (a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 252 to 256...43 VICTORIA (b) 1880
— 257 —265...44 — 1881
— 266 —273...45 — (a) 1882
— 274 & 275...45 — (b) 1882
— 276 to 283...46 — 1883
— 284 —292...47 — 1884
— 293 —301...48 — ... 1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 302 to 307...49 VICTORIA (a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 308 & 309...49 VICTORIA (b) 1886
— 310 to 321...50 — 1887
— 322 —332...51 — 1888
— 333 —340...52 — 1889
— 341 —348...53 — 1890
— 349 —356...54 — ... 1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	EDWARD VII.	1906
—	169 to 182	7	„ „	1907
—	183 to 197	8	„ „	1908

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

MR. ASQUITH'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION

APRIL 1908.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. H. H. ASQUITH, M.P.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord LOREBURN.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. D. LLOYD-GEORGE, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
- Home Department——Rt. Hon. HERBERT J. GLADSTONE, M.P.
- Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir EDWARD GREY, Bt., M.P.
- Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of CREWE.
- War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. HALDANE, M.P.
- India Office——Rt. Hon. LORD MORLEY.

First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. REGINALD MCKENNA, M.P.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. the Earl of CREWE.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. WALTER RUNCIMAN, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. JOHN BURNS, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl CARRINGTON.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. SYDNEY BUXTON, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Lord FITZMAURICE.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. SINCLAIR, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. HARCOURT, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——T. MCKINNON WOOD, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Rt. Hon. HERBERT SAMUEL, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Colonel SEELY, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——T. R. BUCHANAN, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——LORD LUCAS.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——GEORGE WHITELEY, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——C. P. TREVELYAN, Esq. M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Dr. MACNAMARA, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——Sir HUDSON KEARLEY, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——C. F. G. MASTERMAN, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——C. E. HOBHOUSE, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——F. D. ACLAND, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
- J. A. PEASE, Esq., M.P.
- HERBERT LEWIS, Esq., M.P.
- Captain CECIL NORTON, M.P.
- J. H. WHITLEY, Esq., M.P.
- J. M. F. FULLER, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
- Admiral of the Fleet Sir JOHN FISHER.
- Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. DRURY.
- Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. JACKSON.
- Rear-Admiral F. S. INGLEFIELD.

Army Council——
- THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR [*in the Cabinet*].
- General Hon. Sir N. G. LYTTELTON (Chief of the General Staff).
- General C. W. H. DOUGLAS (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
- General Sir W. G. NICHOLSON (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
- Major-General C. F. HADDON (Master-General of the Ordnance).
- THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR.
- THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE.
- *Secretary.* THE PERMANENT UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Colonel Sir E. W. D. WARD).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——GEORGE LAMBERT, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of ABERDEEN.
Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland)——T. W. RUSSELL, Esq., M.P.
The Lord Advocate——THOMAS SHAW, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir W. S. ROBSON, M.P.
Solicitor-General——Sir S. T. EVANS, M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Paymaster-General——R. K. CAUSTON, Esq., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt Hon. Earl BEAUCHAMP.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——J. M. F. FULLER, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of GRANARD.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl GRANVILLE.
- Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
- Lord ACTON.
- Lord COLEBROOKE.
- Lord SUFFIELD.
- Lord HERSCHELL.
- Lord FARQUHAR.

Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of BREADALBANE, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord KINNAIRD.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord DUNEDIN.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Lord MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq
State Steward and Chamberlain——Sir ANTHONY WELDON, D.S.O.
Controller——Lord PIRRIE.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. CHERRY, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, P.C.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq., K.C.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; G. D. Luard, Esq.; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. Ambrey Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright, A. J. Vaughan.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stoll.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir H. F. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M V O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Assistant Shorthand Writer——William Gurney Angus, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. W. Bradshaw.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The Chairman of Ways and Means——Rt. Hon. A. Emmott, M.P.
Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq., C.B.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.; H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Junior Clerks——W. T. Legge, Esq.; C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; W. P. Johnston, Esq.; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour; R. N. Bailey, Esq.; G. F. M. Campion, Esq.; S. de la Poer Beresford, Esq.; H. S. Green, Esq.; O. C. Williams, Esq.; V. W. D. Fox, Esq.; E. F. Wise, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. Edward Gully, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Ernest Moon, Esq., K.C.
Trainbearer——Mr. W. Murrell.
Messenger——Mr. W. Holt.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Vote Office——
Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——John Poyser, Esq. ; W. K. Sanderson, Esq.
Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——V. Kitto, Esq ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin and P. J. Stowell.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq
Printers——
Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman, J. Surry, A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. Inglefield and Mr. H. Hambling.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day, Mr. J. Henderson, Mr. G. Wainwright, Mr. J. Guyatt, Mr. R. Turtle.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington, H. G. Emmett, J. L. Philip, W. Findlay, W. Macdonald, W. R. Brimson, A. New.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley ; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent ; Porters——Messrs. J. Hart and G. Fry.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXCVII.

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.—Ordered, That at the future meetings of the Peers of Scotland, assembled under any Royal Proclamation for the election of a Peer or Peers to represent the Peerage of Scotland in Parliament, the Lord Clerk Register, or the Clerks of Session officiating thereat in his name, do call the title of the Lord Fairfax of Cameron according to its place in the roll of Peers of Scotland called at such election and do receive and count the vote of the Lord Fairfax of Cameron claiming to vote in right of the said Barony, and do permit him to take part in the proceedings in such election 1

Several Lords took the Oath … 1

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Leave given to the Select Committee not to sit again till Monday next … 1

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments … 2

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions in favour of; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. Petitions against; read, and ordered to lie on the Table … 2

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Education.—Statement as to Expenditure by local education authorities on the maintenance of public elementary schools, for the year ended 31st March, 1907 … 22

Uganda.—Correspondence relating to famine in the Busoga District of Uganda 22

Inebriates Acts, 1879-1900.—Report of the Inspector for Scotland, under the Inebriates Acts, for the year 1907 … 23

Rivers Pollution Prevention Act, 1876.—Report to the Secretary for Scotland by His Majesty's Inspector for Scotland under the Act. Presented and ordered to lie on the Table … 23

Navy (Discipline, Prisons).—Rules and Regulations amending regulations for naval prisons … 23

Nov. 24.] *Page*

Superannuation.—Treasury Minute, granting a retired allowance to Mr. William Stead, First Class Officer of Excise.
Laid before the House and ordered to lie on the Table ... — 23

Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907.—Order entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Prohibition of Importation of Bushes) Amendment Order of 1908." Laid before the House and to be printed. [No. 230] 23

Post Office Consolidation Bill. [H.L.]—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 23

CATTLE IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

The Earl of Onslow 23
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 24

NAVY—SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.

Earl Cawdor 25
The Earl of Granard 34
Lord Ellenborough 36
Lord Lochee of Gowrie 41
Lord Leith of Fyvie 49
Lord Eversley 53
Lord Brassey 60
Viscount Midleton 61
The Earl of Granard 64

THE CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS.

Lord Ellenborough 65
The Earl of Granard 68

THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

Lord Muskerry 69

Moved to resolve, "That it is the opinion of this House that, for the better defence of this country, the Government should forbid the granting of Board of Trade certificates for competency as masters or mates to any who are not British subjects."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord Ellenborough... 75
Lord Hamilton of Dalzell... 75
The Earl of Meath... 78
Lord Muskerry 79

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at half-past Seven o'clock till To-morrow at quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petition, against; to lie upon the Table 80

Enfranchisement of Women.—Petition for legislation ; to lie upon the table. 80

Licensing Bill.—Petition in favour ; to lie upon the Table. 80

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Superannuation Act, 1887.—Treasury Minute, granting a Retired Allowance Mr. William Stead, First Class Officer of Excise; to lie upon the Table. ... 80

Board of Education.—Statement as to Expenditure by Local Education Authorities on the Maintenance of Public Elementary Schools for the year ended 31st March, 1907; to lie upon the Table 80

Uganda.—Correspondence relating to Famine in the Busoga District of Uganda; to lie upon the Table 80

Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907.—Order entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Prohibition of Importation of Bushes) Amendment Order of 1908;" to lie upon the Table 80

Navy (Prisons).—Rules and Regulations, dated 29th October, 1908, amending Regulations for Naval Prisons made by the Admiralty under the Naval Discipline Act; to lie upon the Table 80

Rivers Pollution Prevention Act, 1876.—Report to the Secretary for Scotland by His Majesty's Inspector for Scotland under the Act; to lie upon the Table... 80

Inebriates Acts (Scotland).—Report for Scotland under the Inebriates Acts for the year 1907; to lie upon the Table 80

Dublin Metropolitan Police.—Return ordered, "showing the amount of annual expenditure incurred for the upkeep of the Dublin Metropolitan Police" 80

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Persons found in Destitute Condition in Public Places 81
Indian Regiments Changing Stations by Road 82
Distress Committee for Stoke-on-Trent 83
Sanction for Loan for Electric Mains at Stoke-on-Trent 83
Burwell Farm, Cambridgeshire 84
Old-Age Pension Regulations—Opportunity for Discussion 85
Education Bill—Regulations under Clause 2 85
Public Elementary Schools 86
Unemployed Distress at Southwick-on-Wear 86
Board of Trade Examination Fees... 87
Appointments to Assistant Surveyorship of Taxes 87
Evicted Tenants—Case of Mrs. M'Cabe of Ross 88
Appointment of Miss G. Knox to Ardess National School 89
Evicted Tenants - Case of Patrick Drum... 89

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Shipbuilding—Cost of Increased Speed 90
New Torpedo Destroyers 90
Manning of the Navy 91
Territorial Force—7th Battalion Sherwood Foresters 92
Murder of a Dacca Student 93
Royal Indian Marine 93
Reforms in India 94

Nov. 24.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 5, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided further that where, prior to the commencement of this Act, a governing body as aforesaid or any joint or central board on their behalf have established a superannuation fund to which they respectively contribute, directly or indirectly, the superannuation allowance awarded to a teacher to the extent represented by the sum so contributed shall be held to be a retiring allowance within the meaning of this section.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 21, after the word 'boards,' to insert the words 'governing bodies.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshre, St. Albans) 14

Amendments proposed—

"In page 10, line 28, after the word 'Department,' to insert the words 'or of a teacher's superannuation allowance from a governing body as aforesaid or any joint or central board on their behalf.'"

"In page 10, line 34, to leave out the word 'or.'"

"In page 10, line 34, after the word 'managers,' to insert the words 'or joint or central board.'"

"In page 10, line 34, at end, to insert the words 'or superannuation.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Cochrane (*Ayrshire, N.*) 148

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, line 16, to leave out the word 'may,' and to insert the word 'shall.'"

"In page 11, line 16, at end, to insert the words 'or of an Amendment thereof.'"

"In page 11, line 26, after the word 'boards,' to insert the words 'governing bodies.'"

"In page 11, line 26, after the word 'and,' to insert the word 'other.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Boland (*Kerry, S.*) 149

Amendment proposed—

"In page 12, line 26, to leave out subsection (1) of Clause 14."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Sinclair 151

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. Lamont (*Buteshire*) 151
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) 153

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 10, at end, to insert the words, '(*f*) To making payments to school boards in Gaelic-speaking districts of such sums as may be necessary to make adequate provision for instruction in reading and writing the Gaelic language, and also of such sums as may be necessary to increase the number of bursaries available, both before and after the junior student stage, for Gaelic-speaking children intending to become teachers.'"—(*Mr. Lamont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair ... 154
Mr. Munro Ferguson (*Leith, Burghs*) ... 154
Mr. Boland ... 155
Mr. Weir (*Ross and Cromarty*) ... 156
Mr. Pirie (*Aberdeen, N.*) ... 156
Mr. Sinclair ... 157
Mr. Cochrane ... 158
Mr. Morton (*Sutherland*) ... 158

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 109; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 414.)

Mr. J. M. Macdonald (*Falkirk Burghs*) ... 161

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 24, line 18, to leave out subsection (2) of Clause 15." —(*Mr. J. M. Macdonald.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for,' in page 14, line 21, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Cochrane ... 164
Mr. Wilkie (*Dundee*) ... 166
Mr. Menzies (*Lanarkshire, S.*) ... 167
Mr. Sinclair ... 170
Mr. Pirie ... 173
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (*Lanarkshire, N.W.*) ... 175
Mr. Munro Ferguson (*Leith Burghs*) ... 176

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Menzies ... 177
Mr. Dundas White (*Dumbartonshire*) ... 178

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 21, to leave out from the word 'district,' to end of clause, and to insert the words, 'so as to give an equal amount, for every child in average attendance at their respective school or schools, to all school boards and other managers of State-aided schools, but that only after reservation of the sum of twenty-five thousand pounds to be given, at the absolute discretion of the Department, to necessitous schools or schools in thinly-populated districts.'"—(*Mr. Menzies*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'in,' in line 24, stand part of the Bill.'"

Mr. Sinclair ... 179

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Morton ... 180

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, lines 29 and 30, to leave out the words 'which scheme shall be laid before Parliament,' and to insert the words 'Provided that such scheme shall be forthwith laid before both Houses of Parliament if Parliament be sitting, or, if not, then within three weeks after the commencement of the next ensuing session of Parliament, and if neither House of Parliament within one month, exclusive of any period of prorogation, after a scheme has been laid before it, presents an address praying the King to withhold his assent from such

Nov. 24.] *Page*

scheme or any part thereof, it shall be lawful for the King in Council by Order to approve the same or any part thereof to which such address does not relate. The presentation of an address as aforesaid shall be without prejudice to the making of a further scheme under the like procedure. (4) A scheme under this section may be amended by a subsequent scheme made under the like procedure. (5) Any scheme approved by Order in Council under this section shall, as from the date prescribed in such Order, be of the same force as if it were enacted in this Act.' "—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 14, line 40, after the word 'parents,' to insert the words 'or guardians.' "

"In page 15, line 9, to leave out from the word 'of,' to end of line 10, and to insert the words 'income from all sources other than from school rate.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Munro Ferguson. 181

Amendment proposed—

"In page 15, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'except burghs and parishes which have made provision for their own scholars.' "—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 182

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 15, line 20, to leave out the word 'fund,' and to insert the word board.' "

"In page 15, line 21, after the word 'maintenance,' to insert the words 'after deduction of income from grants made by the Department or from fees, and of any sum paid to the school board under the immediately preceding sub-section.' "

"In page 16, line 21, after the word 'aforesaid,' to insert the words 'or, in circumstances approved by the Department, at a supplementary course of not less than three years duration conducted in accordance with Article 21 of the Code of Regulations for day schools of 1908 or under other regulations of the Department that may come in place thereof.' "

"In page 16, line 23, at end; to insert the words 'or training college.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Cochrane 182

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 26, after the word 'board,' to insert the words 'or the managers of any inspected school.' "—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 183

Amendments negatived.

Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan) 184
Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College) 184

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 19, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided always that it shall not be competent under this section to annexe a school board district having a population of over fifty thousand to an adjacent school board district unless the districts concerned are agreed in desiring such union.'"—(*Mr. Robert Duncan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 185

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Sinclair 185

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 7, to leave out subsection (2) and to insert the following: (2) The following regulations with respect to audit shall be observed (that is to say) (*a*) Before each audit the clerk of the school board shall, after receiving from the accountant of the Department the requisite appointment, give at least fourteen days notice in such manner as shall be prescribed from time to time, of the time and place at which the audit will be made, and of the deposit of accounts required by this section, and of the name and address of the accountant of the Department; (*b*) An abstract in duplicate of the accounts, duly made up, balanced, and signed as aforesaid, shall, together with all assessment books, account books, deeds, contracts, accounts, vouchers, and receipts mentioned or referred to in such accounts, be deposited in the offices of the school board and be open between the hours of eleven forenoon and three afternoon to the inspection of all ratepayers within the district of the school board liable to contribute to the school fund, as hereinbefore provided, for seven clear days before the audit, and all such persons shall be at liberty to take copies of or extracts from the same, without any fee; and any officer of the school board duly appointed in that behalf refusing to allow inspection thereof shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds. (*c*) For the purpose of any audit under this Act the accountant of the Department may, by demand in writing, require the production before him of all books, deeds, contracts, accounts, vouchers, receipts, and other documents and papers which he may deem necessary, and may require any person holding the same, or accountable therefor, to appear before him at any such audit, or any adjournment thereof, and to make and sign a declaration as to the correctness of the same; and if such person neglects or refuses so to appear, or to produce any such books, deeds, contracts, accounts, vouchers, receipts, documents, or papers, or to make or sign such declaration, he shall incur for every neglect or refusal a penalty not exceeding forty shillings; and if he falsely or corruptly makes or signs any such declaration, knowing the same to be untrue in any material particular, he shall be liable to the penalties inflicted on persons guilty of perjury. (*d*) Any ratepayer may make any objection to such accounts or any part thereof, and shall transmit the same and the grounds thereof in writing to the accountant of the Department, and a copy thereof to the officer concerned, two clear days before the time fixed for the audit, and any ratepayer may be present at the audit and may support any objection made as hereinbefore provided either by himself or by any ratepayer. (*e*) If it shall appear to the accountant of the Department acting in pursuance of this section that any payment is in his opinion contrary to law and should be disallowed, or that any sum which in his opinion ought to have been, is not brought into account by any person, whether such payment or failure to account has been made matter of objection or not, he shall, by an Interim Report under his hand, report thereon to the Department setting forth the grounds of his opinion as aforesaid, and the Department shall cause such Interim Report to be intimated to the objector, if any, and to the officer or other person affected thereby; and after due inquiry the Department shall decide all questions raised by such Interim Report, and shall disallow all illegal payments, and shall allow all sums which ought to have been but have not been brought into account, and, in the event of any expenditure, of the same nature as any payment so disallowed being incurred by the school board in any subsequent year, the Department, if they should be of opinion that the members authorising such expenditure should be surcharged, may present a petition to either Division of the Court of Session craving to have such expenditure declared illegal and the said members of the school board ordained to refund the amount of such expenditure in the event of it being declared illegal; and the Court shall, before granting or refusing the prayer of such petition, consider any representations made in answer thereto by the members proposed to be surcharged, and the Court shall have power to find that the expenses of the said proceedings shall be payable by the said members personally or out of the school fund as may appear just. (*f*) Within fourteen days after the completion of the audit, or, as the case may be, after any proceedings under the immediately preceding paragraph of this subsection have been disposed of, the accountant of the Department shall report on the accounts audited, and shall certify on each duplicate abstract thereof the amount in words at length of the expenditure so audited and allowed, and further that the regulations with respect to the accounts have been complied with, and that he has ascertained by the audit the correctness of the accounts. He shall forthwith send one duplicate abstract of the accounts hereinbefore mentioned to the school board, who shall cause the same to be deposited in their office, and shall publish such abstract in the form prescribed in some one or more of the newspapers circulating in the district of the school board. The accountant of the Department shall also forthwith send the other duplicate abstract of the accounts so certified by him to the Department. Provided that, if the Secretary for Scotland shall so determine, such abstract may come in place of and render unnecessary a return of the receipts and expenditure of the school board in pursuance of the Local Taxation Returns (Scotland) Act, 1881. (*g*) Where any surcharge has been made as hereinbefore provided, or the accountant of the Department has made any Interim Report or Report respecting the accounts or the receipts and expenses of the school board, the school board shall cause the surcharge and Interim Report or Report to be printed and published together with the abstract of their accounts hereinbefore mentioned, and to be delivered to any ratepayer, as in this section mentioned, who asks for the same, and in case of default in such publication the Department may cause the same to be published, and the cost of such publication, to the amount certified by the Department, shall be a debt due from the school board to His Majesty, and the clerk of the school board shall be liable in case of default in such publication to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds. (*h*) Notwithstanding any thing in this section the Department may by minute prescribe rules modifying any enactment contained in this subsection as to the time and place of audit.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Cochrane 190
Sir George McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 193
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 193

Page
Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) 194
Mr. Munro Ferguson 194
The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thos. Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 195

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. James Hope (Sheffield Central) 195
Mr. Cochrane 196

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 30, at end, to insert the words '(4) Any school board shall be entitled to make application to the Accountant of the Department respecting any expenditure which they may propose to incur. If such expenditure receives the sanction of the Accountant of the Department it shall not subsequently be regarded as an illegal payment liable to be disallowed or surcharged on the person or persons making such payment.'"—(*Mr. Cochrane*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 197
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson 198
Sir Henry Craik 198
Mr. Cochrane 199

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. James Hope 199

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 31, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'at each election after the election taking place in the year nineteen hundred and nine.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair*).

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Watt 200
Mr. Pirie 201

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 33, to leave out from the word 'district," to end of subsection, and to insert the words 'Provided that an existing school board holding office at the passing of this Act shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, retain office until the first election of school boards under this Act, which election shall take place in the year nineteen hundred and eleven, being the year following the year of a parish council election.'"—(*Mr. Watt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the second word 'the' in page 22, line 34, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Sinclair 202

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 22, line 34, to leave out from the word '1872' to end of line 38."

"In page 22, line 39, after the word 'election,' to insert the words 'after the election in the year nineteen hundred and nine.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. James Hope 203

Nov. 24.] Page

Amendment proposed—

"In page 23, line 5, to leave out subsection (3)."—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the subsection down to the word 'give' in line 6, stand part of the clause."

Mr. Sinclair 203
Mr. Munro Ferguson 204
Mr. Boland 205
Mr. Beale (Ayrshire, S.) 205
Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs) 205
Mr. Morton 206
Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 206
Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie) 207
Mr. McCullum (Paisley) 208
Mr. R. Duncan 208

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Mitchell-Thomson 209

Amendment proposed—

"In page 23, line 30, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'before granting or refusing the prayer of the petition and complaint.'"—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 3, after the second word 'exceeding,' to insert the words 'seven hundred pounds per annum in the case of endowments the revenues of which before the passing of this Act might be applied to purposes in two or more counties, or in any other case not exceeding.'"—(*Mr. Watt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 209

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 12, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that the governing body of any intermediate or secondary school administered under a scheme approved in terms of the Educational Endowments (Scotland) Act, 1882, or under any Act or any Provisional Order confirmed by Act of Parliament, shall, notwithstanding anything contained in any scheme, Act, or Order, have power, with the sanction of the Department, to administer that part of their annual revenue, presently applicable to the granting of bursaries, in conformity with the requirements of Section twenty-eight thereof without the necessity of applying to the Court of Session or to Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 210

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 40, after the word 'council,' to insert the words 'or county education committee.'"—(*Mr. Cochrane*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 210

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Gulland 211

Amendment proposed —

"In page 26, line 10, after the word 'Department, to insert the words 'which in future shall be called the Scottish Education Department.' "—(*Mr. Gulland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Thos. Shaw 211

Amendments proposed—

"In page 26, line 25, to leave out the word 'Third,' and to insert the word 'Second.' "

"In page 27, line 17, to leave out the word 'Fourth,' and to insert the word 'Third.' "

"In page 29, to leave out Schedule 2.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Pirie 212
Mr. Boland 216
Mr. Morton 217
Mr. Belloc (*Salford, S.*) 218

Question put:

The House divided :—Ayes, 195 ; Noes, 48. (Division List No. 415.)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Prevention of Crime Bill.—As amended by the Standing Committee, considered.

Mr. Renton (*Lincolnshire, Gainsborough*) 221
Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 223

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) of clause 1."—(*Major Renton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 224
Mr. Staveley-Hill (*Staffordshire, Kingswinford*) 226
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 226
Mr. John O'Connor Kildare, N.) 227
Mr. Carlile (*Herts, St. Albans*) 229

Amendment negatived.

Sir F. Banbury 230

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out the words 'apparently under such age.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. Gladstone 231

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 31, after the word 'imprisonment,' to insert the words 'being within the limits of age within which persons may be detained in a Borstal institution.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Rawlinson 231
Sir F. Banbury 232

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 40, after the word 'establish,' to insert the word 'three.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' be there inserted."

Mr. Gladstone 232

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Rawlinson 232

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 29, to leave out Clause 7."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the clause proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Gladstone 233

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.) 233
Mr. Belloc 236

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, to leave out Part II. of the Bill."—(*Mr. Atherley Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'whether' in page 5, line 7, stand part of the Bill."

Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) 238
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 243
Mr. Gladstone 246
Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 255

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Henry Forster.*)

Mr. Gladstone 256

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The Lord Cranworth took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order No. 3) Bill.—Petition of Messrs. Rees and Freres, of 5, Victoria Street, Westminster, Parliamentary Agents, praying for leave to present a petition of owners and ratepayers in the

Page

borough of Hanley, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such petition has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table, and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered To-morrow in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition 257

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions in favour of; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. Petitions against: read, and ordered to lie on the Table 257

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series) [No. 671].—China. Presented and ordered to lie on the Table 280

Licensing Bill [SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) 280

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 299

Amendment moved—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that' for the purpose of inserting the words 'this House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Lord Ribblesdale 314
The Lord Bishop of London 324
Lord Lamington 332
Lord St. David's 336
The Earl of Malmesbury 347
Viscount St. Aldwyn 351
The Earl of Carlisle 364
The Lord Bishop of Bristol 367

Debate adjourned till to-morrow.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 231].

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Eleven o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 25th NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Hastings Harbour Bill.—Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 370

Nov. 25.] Page

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 371

Natal.—Petition of Francis E. Colenso, for inquiry into the conduct of affairs; to lie upon the Table 371

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 671; to lie upon the Table 371

East India (Military) Operations.—Address for "Return of Military Operations undertaken by the Government of India on the North-West frontier, the North-East frontier, and beyond India."

East India Customs (Revenue).—Order [16th June] for an Address for Return relative thereto read, and discharged; East India (Customs Revenue) Address for Return 371

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Rate of Payment for Casual Labour employed by Post Office during Christmas Pressure 371

Engine Room Artificers—Successful Candidates at Belfast 372

Irish Department of Agriculture and Home and Cottage Industries 373

Grindleton Churchyard near Clitheroe 373

Small Holding Applications in Surrey 374

Classification under the Hobhouse Report 374

Boycotting in Ireland 374

Valuation of Clyde Foreshore above Greenock 375

Small Holding Applications in Somersetshire 375

Rejection of Flour supplied to Admiralty 377

Chelsea Unemployed Scheme 378

Unemployed Men now Working for Metropolitan Borough Councils 378

Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief Refunded 379

Railway Station for Glenflesk, Co. Kerry 379

Landing of Hay and Straw in Ireland 379

Lighting of Lamps at Annalong Harbour, Co. Down 380

Boundaries of the Penrose Estate, Simla 380

Sale of Non-residential Grass Lands for Purposes of Enlarging Desmesnes ... 381

Licensing Reform in Ireland 381

Irish Land Purchase—Redemption of Annuity in Stock 382

Uncollected Seed Rate at Castlerea 382

Evicted Tenants—Claim of Mrs. Killen and Mrs. Hobson 383

Action of Mr. W. T. Potts at South Roscommon... 384

Appointment to Vacant Inspectorship of Irish National Schools 385

Crossga Labourers' Cottage Scheme 385

Irish Land Purchase... 385

Police Inspectors in Co. Galway 386

Appointment of Unemployed Colonels 387

Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Shipbuilding Delays... 387
Naval Destroyers 388
Reinstatement of Devonport Labourers 390
Victualling Yard Stores Reserves... 390
Naval Visits to South Africa 390
British Indians in the Transvaal 391
Treaty of Berlin 391
Income Tax on Patent Royalties 392
Unpresented Bank-notes 392
Terminable Annuities 393
Old-Age Pension Claimants... 393
Press Representation at Coroner's Inquest 394
Restrictions on the Employment of Children 394
Chinese Immigrants at Liverpool 395
Lostock Gralam Crossing Fatality... 396
America and the Law of Copyright 396
Betting Telegrams 397
Publicans as Postmasters 398
Board of Education Circular 596 398
Status of Educational and Medical Officers 399
Board of Education Circular 576 399
Grants to Denominational Schools 400
Expenditure of Local Education Authority 401
Swansea Education Dispute... 402
Education Bill—"Children in Attendance" 402
Parents and Religious Instruction in Schools 403
River Tweed Salmon Fisheries 403
Foot and-Mouth Disease 404
Lansdowne Estate, Queen's County 404
River Barrow Floods 405
Firearm Outrages in Ireland 406
Persons under Police Protection 406
Boycotting in Ireland 407
Agrarian Outrages 407
Irish Nationalist Newspapers 408
Knockmay Alleged Outrage 408
Drainage of the Barrow 410
Morragh Bernard Evicted Tenant 411
Lord Kenmare's Estate 412
Macroom Labourer's Cottage 413
Valentia Island Coastguard Station 414
Business of the House 415

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [Lords.]—Reported, without Amendment, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 336.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 336.]

Bill (not amended) to be taken into consideration To-morrow ... 416

White Phosphorous Matches Prohibition Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 337.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 337.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 383.] 416

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [**Lords.**]—Read the first time, to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 384.] 417

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES.)—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; Report to lie upon the Table 417

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury*) ... 417

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Mr. Hutton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Morley*) 431
Mr. Clement Edwardes (*Denbigh Districts*) 440

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 451
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 459
Sir George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 456
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 476
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 483
Mr. Massie (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 490
Lord Edmund Talbot (*Sussex, Chichester*) 493
Mr. Helme (*Lancashire, Lancaster*) 499
Mr. Joynson-Hicks (*Manchester, N.W.*) 503
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty (*Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.*) 514
Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (*Leicester*) 523

Motion made and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*)—

Put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute before Eleven o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 26TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions in favour of; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. Petitions against; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 533

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Army.—War Office Report on the steps taken during 1907 to provide technical instruction to soldiers to fit them for civil life. Presented, and pursuant to Address of the 16th inst. 537

Trade Reports (Annual Series.)—No. 4172. Austria Hungary. Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table 537

Shop Hours Act, 1904 (Urban District of Hindley).—Order made by the urban district council of Hindley 537

Public Records, Colonial Office (New Zealand Company).—Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which have been removed from the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State having the Department of the Colonies and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein. Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table 537

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade, CLXII.—CLXXXV. Laid before the House, and to be printed. [No. 232.] 537

Licensing Bill.—Order of the day read for resuming the adjourned debate on the Amendment moved by the Marquess of Lansdowne to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2ª, viz., to leave out all the words after "That" for the purpose of inserting the following words, "this House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendment which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill."

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 538
The Earl of Halsbury 550
The Earl of Rosebery 560
Lord Robertson 572
Viscount Halifax 578
The Lord Bishop of Birmingham 579
Lord Belper 585
Lord Faber 590
Lord Willoughby de Broke 597
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 601
The Lord Steward (Earl Beauchamp) 614
The Earl of Camperdown 626
Viscount Galway 633
Lord Glantawe 635

Debate adjourned till To-morrow.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 26TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London Electric Supply Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 638

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Army.—Report by the War Office on the steps taken during 1907 to provide Technical Instruction to Soldiers to fit them for Civil Life; to lie upon the Table 638

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade under the Act; to lie upon the Table 638

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 4172; to lie upon the Table 639

East India (Military Operations).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table 639

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the Urban District Council of Hindley; to lie upon the Table 639

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Records (Colonial Office) (New Zealand Company). Copy of Schedule containing a list and particulars of Classes of Documents which have been removed from the Office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State having the Department of the Colonies, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein 639

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sanitation at Ramsey 639
Inquest on Blackburn Weaver 640
Mullingar District Lunatic Asylum 640
King's Road, Chelsea, Sub-Post Office 641
Aldridge Colliery Accident 641
Taxi-Cabs at London Railway Termini 642
Unemployment in the United States 642
Kinmare Estate, Evicted Tenants 643
Irish University Charter 643
Teachers' Salaries 644
Mountjoy Prison—Death of Richard O'Brien 645
Food and Drug Adulteration in Ireland 645
Kilrush Incendiary Fires 646
Holy Cross Disturbances 646
Pension Regulations 647
Supplies for Irish Government Offices 648
Scottish Income-Tax, Commissioners' Clerks 648
Chatham Dockyard 648

Page
Proposed Floating Dock in the Medway 648
Hayti Disturbances 649
New Destroyers 649
Naval Campaign Plans 649
Professor Marshall's Memorandum 650
Old-Age Pensions Act Administration 650
Irish Land Purchase Sinking Fund 651
Wine Duties 652
Irish Union Returns 652
Irish Pension Officers' Instructions 652
Scottish Church Registers 653
Cork Barracks 653
Territorial Artillery Units 654
Irish Land Purchase Bonuses 654
Elstree Parish Council Allotments 655
Anæsthetics at the Metropolitan Hospital 655
Telegraphists at Race Meetings 657
Racing Telegrams 657
Beri-beri Report 658
Licences for Motor Vehicles 658
Antrim Royal Garrison Artillery 658
Royal Engineer Staff Removal Expenses 659

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE

Indian Reforms 660
Ceylon Indian Recruiting Agency 661
Education in India 661
Conconado Police Punitive Force 661
Rhodesian Big Game Preserves 662
Disturbances in Hayti 663
Continental Education Laws 664
Persia 665
Russian Officers in the Shah's Service 665
Persia—The New Constitution 665
The Shah's Promise 666
Papers on Persia 666
Representations to the Shah of Persia 667
Conduct of Police Inquiries 668
Incendiary Furze Fires in Guernsey 669
Lead in Hollow Ware 669
Linlithgow Miners' Disturbances 670
Deportation of Aliens 670
Chelmsford Election Disturbances 671
Copenshay (Orkney)—Lighthouse Required 673

Nov. 26.] *Page*

Railway Working Agreements ... 673
Railway and Canal Commission ... 675
Unemployment Statistics ... 675
Imports of Roofing Slates ... 676
Women Teachers ... 676
Irish Teachers ... 678
Systematic Moral Instruction ... 677
Denominational Definitions ... 678
Plant of Contracting-out Schools ... 678
Boy Clerkships ... 679
Government Blotting Paper Contract ... 679
Meat Supplies and Prices ... 680
Small Holdings in Hampshire ... 682
Small Holdings Commissioners ... 683
Board of Agriculture ... 683
Administration of the Small Holdings Act ... 684
Mayo Cattle Drives ... 684
Riverstown Disturbances—Death of John Stenson ... 685
State Purchase of Irish Railways ... 686
United Irish League ... 686
Threatening Notice to a Galway Magistrate ... 687
Riverstown United Irish League ... 687
Cost of Teaching Irish in Irish Schools ... 688
Price of Land in County Clare ... 689
Boxwell Evicted Tenants ... 689
Police Actions against Cattle Drivers ... 689
Boycotted Protestants at Riverstown ... 690
Failure to Report Irish Outrages ... 690
Cappamore (Limerick) Untenanted Lands ... 691
Labourers' Cottages in County Clare ... 691
Crimes in County Clare ... 692
Holycross (Tipperary) Disturbances ... 692
Gortdromerillagh Outrage ... 692
The Mount St. Vincent Orphanage ... 693
Work of the Estates Commissioners ... 694
County Westmeath Police ... 694
Kilbeggan Cattle-Drive ... 695
Killdorrery Labourer's Cottage ... 696
Irish Land Bill ... 695
Unemployed in Limerick ... 696
Ballyfarnon Cattle-Drive ... 697
Irish Extra-Police Charges ... 697
Galway Extra Police ... 698
Mr. Frank North's Kerry Estate ... 698

Nov. 26.] *Page*

Killarney Fair Rent Appeals 699

King-Harman Estate Tenantry 699

Public Accounts Committee 700

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill 700

Parliament and the Ratification of Treaties 700

Pension Regulations 701

Disturbances at Cashel 702

Business of the House 703

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection. Report to lie upon the Table ... 704

Business of the House (Elementary Education (England and Wales) No. 2 Bill).—Motion made and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of this House)."—(*Mr. Asquith*).

The House divided:—Ayes, 239; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 416) ... 704

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill.—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [25th November], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Hutton.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 707

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 723

Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) 731

Mr. Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 741

Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 745

Mr. Butcher (*Cambridge University*) 755

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (*Mr. Trevelyan, Yorks, W. R., Elland*) 760

Mr. George Roberts (*Norwich*) 768

Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 775

Sir Robert Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 776

Mr. Boland (*Kerry, S.*) 781

Sir John Kennaway (*Devonshire, Honiton*) 783

Mr. Adkins (*Lancashire, Middleton*) 787

Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 791

Mr. William Jones (*Carnarvonshire, Arfon*) 797

Mr. Lane-Fox (*Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash*) 802

Sir Brampton Gurdon (*Norfolk, N.*) 807

Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (*Newington, Walworth*) 809

Lord Willoughby de Eresby (*Lincolnshire, Horncastle*) 811

Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 813

Mr. Nield (*Middlesex, Ealing*) 817

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 323; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 417.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Nov. 26.] Page

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, FRIDAY, 27th NOVEMBER, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 825

Moved "That Standing Order No. 93 be considered in order to its being dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of Owners and Ratepayers in the Borough of Hanley."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Standing Order No. 93 considered (according to order) and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of Owners and Ratepayers in the Borough of Hanley. Leave given to present the said petition.

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions in favour of : Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.
Petitions against : Read and ordered to lie on the Table.
Petition praying for Amendment of : and ordered to lie on the Table ... 827

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Order of yesterday for the printing of Rules made by the Board of Trade, discharged 827

Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill.—Draft regulations under Clause 2. 827

Irish Land Commission.—Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of April, 1908.
Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Post Office Telegraphs and Telephones.—An account showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the telegraph service during the year ended 31st March, 1908, and the balance of the expenditure over receipts, prepared in pursuance of Section 4 of the 39th Vict., c. 5, and a statement additional to the above account, prepared in pursuance of the same section, together with an account showing the gross amount received and the gross amount expended in respect of the telegraph service and telephone service (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 18 of session 1908), and certain other statistics. Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table 827

Licensing Bill—Order of the Day read for resuming the adjourned debate on the Amendment moved by the Marquess of Lansdowne to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2^a, viz., to leave out all the words after "That" for the purpose of inserting the following words: "this House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His

Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill."

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 828
Viscount Hardinge 842
Lord Burghclere 844
Lord Ashbourne 848
Lord Kinnaird 853
Viscount Hill 858
The Lord Bishop of Southwark 863
The Earl of Lytton... 871
Lord Harris 887
Viscount Ridley 890
The Chancellor and the Duchy (Lord Fitzmaurice) 894
The Earl of Meath... 906
Earl Cawdor 908
The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 919

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out, stand part of the Question."

On Question, Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 96; Not-Contents, 272.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 27TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London (Westminster and Kensington) Electric Supply Companies Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

East India (Military Operations).—Return to be printed. [No. 338.]

Natal—Papers relating to the case of Mr. Alfred Mangena; to lie upon the Table.

Irish Land Commission.—Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of April, 1908; to lie upon the Table.

Education (England and Wales) (No 2) Bill.—Draft Regulations under Clause 2 of the Bill; to lie upon the Table.

Building Grants.—Further Statement showing the Cases in which the Board of Education have received Applications from Local Education Authorities for Special Grants for the Building of New Public Elementary Schools, and the stage which each Case had reached on 31st October, 1908; to lie upon the Table.

Post Office Telegraphs, including Telephones.—Account presented, showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the Telegraph Service during the year ended 31st March, 1908, etc.; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 339.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Division of Untenanted Land on Estate of Mrs. Shelton at Beaufort 935
Delay in Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants at Lane Joynt Estate 935
Distribution of Untenanted Land on the Mersey Estate 936

Nov. 27.]

Page

Evicted Tenants—Application of Mrs. B. O'Connell 936

Delay in Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on the Waller Estate 937

Sick Leave of Colonial Office Staff in British East Africa 937

Subsidies to Steamship Lines 937

The Salvation Army... 939

House of Commons—Rooms for Officials 940

Government Contracts—Pay of Carpenters 940

Barrow-in-Furness Distress Committee 941

Lowry Cave and Ougherdrum Estates—Restoration of Evicted Tenants ... 941

Cost of Irish Land Policy 942

Distribution of Grant to Irish National School Teachers 942

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate Enactments relating to the Post Office." [Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords] 943

Post Office Consolidation Bill [**Lords**].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 385] 943

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection. Report to lie upon the Table 943

Elementary Education (**England and Wales**) [**Grants**].—Committee to consider of authorising the payment of certain Parliamentary Grants in pursuance of any Act of the present session to make further provision with respect to Elementary Education in England and Wales (King's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.

Mr. Runciman 943

Business of the House (**Elementary Education** (**England and Wales**) (**No. 2**) **Bill**) (**Allocation of Time**).

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 943

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee Stage, Report Stage, and Third Reading of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, and the necessary stages of the Financial Resolution relating thereto shall be proceeded with as follows:—1 Committee stage. Six allotted days shall be given to the Committee stage of the Bill, including the necessary stages of the Financial Resolution relating to the Bill, and the proceedings on each of those allotted days shall be those shown in the second column of the table annexed to this Order, and those proceedings shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at the time shown in the third column of that table. 2. Report stage. Two allotted days shall be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and the proceedings for each of those allotted days shall be such as may be hereafter determined in manner provided by this Order, and those proceedings, if not previously brought to a conclusion, shall be brought to a conclusion at 10.30 p.m. on each such allotted day. 3. Third Reading. One allotted day shall be given to the Third Reading of the Bill, and the proceedings thereon shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at 10.30 p.m. on that day. On the conclusion of the Committee stage the Chairman shall report the Bill to the House without Question put, and the House shall on a subsequent day, consider the proposals made by the Government for the allocation of the proceedings on the Report

stage of the Bill. The proceedings on the consideration of those proposals may be entered on at any hour, though opposed, and shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the sittings of the House, but if they are not brought to a conclusion before the expiration of one hour after they have been commenced, Mr. Speaker shall, at the expiration of that time, bring them to a conclusion by putting the Question on the Motion proposed by the Government, after having put the Question, if necessary, on any Amendment or other Motion which has been already proposed from the Chair and not disposed of. After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill. Provided that 5 p.m. shall be substituted for 10.30 p.m., and 2 p.m. for 7.30 p.m. as respects any allotted day which is a Friday, and 3 p.m. shall be substituted for 10.30 p.m. and 12 noon for 7.30 p.m. as respects any allotted day which is a Saturday, as the time at which proceedings are to be brought to a conclusion under the foregoing provisions. A Motion may be made by a Minister of the Crown at the commencement of business on any day that the House sit on the following Saturday at 10 a.m. for the purpose of the consideration of the Bill, and the Question on any Motion so made shall be put forthwith by the Speaker without Amendment or debate. Notice of any Question requiring an oral answer for a Friday or Saturday shall, if that day is an allotted day under this Order, be treated as a notice for the following Monday. For the purpose of bringing to a conclusion any proceedings which are to be brought to a conclusion on an allotted day, and have not previously been brought to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman shall, at the time appointed under this Order for the conclusion of those proceedings, put forthwith the Question on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments, new Clauses, or Schedules moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, Clause, or Schedules, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new Clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be. A Motion may be made by the Government to leave out any Clause or consecutive Clauses of the Bill before the consideration of any Amendments to the Clause or Clauses in Committee. The Question on a Motion made by the Government to leave out any Clause or Clauses of the Bill shall be put forthwith by the Chairman or Speaker without debate. Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order 'Time for taking Private Business,' be taken after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill or under this Order for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. On any day on which any proceedings are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, proceedings for that purpose under this Order shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. On an allotted day no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to re-commit the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to

Nov. 27.]

postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Government, and the Question on such Motion shall be put forthwith without any debate. Nothing in this Order shall—(*a*) prevent any business which under this Order is to be concluded on an allotted day being proceeded with on any other day, or necessitate any allotted day or part of an allotted day being given to any such business if the business to be concluded has been otherwise disposed of; or (*b*) prevent any other business being proceeded with on any allotted day or part of an allotted day in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House after the business to be proceeded with or concluded under this Order on the allotted day or part of the allotted day has been disposed of."

TABLE.

Committee Stage.

Allotted Day.	Proceedings.	Time for Proceedings to be brought to a Conclusion.
First - - -	Clause 1 - - - - -	10.30
Second - - -	Clause 2, and Committee stage of Financial Resolution - - -	10.30
Third - - -	Report stage of Financial Resolution, and Clause 3 - - - -	10.30
Fourth - - -	Clause 4 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clause 5 - - - - - -	10.30
Fifth - - -	Clause 6 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clauses 7, 8, and 9 - - - -	10.30
Sixth - - -	Clauses 10, 11, 12, and new Clauses -	7.30
	Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion - - -	10·30

—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Mr. Forster (*Kent, Sevenoaks*) 951

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after 'That,' and to add the words 'this House, being of opinion that a settlement of the education question by general agreement is urgently required, and that such agreement can only be secured if the views of all parties interested are fully discussed by this House, regrets that exceptional means of curtailing debate should be used to force precipitately through its remaining stages a measure touching complicated interests and rousing vehement feelings.'"—(*Mr. Forster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the Committee stage, Report stage,' stand part of the Resolution."

Mr. Belloc (*Salford, S.*) 957
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 958

Page

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 963
Mr. Asquith 966
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 968
Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) 970
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 972
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) 975
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) 976
Sir Philip Magnus (London University) 981
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 984
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 987
Mr. Hart Davies (Hackney, N.) 989
Lord Robert Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 989
Mr. Byles (Salford, N.) 992
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 993
The President of The Board of Education (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) ... 1002
Mr. Clement Edwards (Denbigh District) 1003
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1005
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1008

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 194 ; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 418.)

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to leave out the word 'six,' and insert the word 'eight.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question, "That the word 'six' stand part of the Question," put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That the word 'eight' be there inserted."

Sir F. Banbury 1011

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'eight,' and to insert the word 'ten.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'eight' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Asquith 1011
Lord R. Cecil 1012

Amendment to proposed Amendment negatived.

Question put, "That the word 'eight' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

New Table substituted.

Main Question, as amended, again proposed.

Main Question, as amended, put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 192 ; Noes, 58. (Division List No. 419.)

Main Question, as amended, agreed to.

Whereupon MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 30TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Leave given to the Select Committee to continue sitting in the absence of the Lord Monk Bretton 1021

Hastings Harbour Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 1021

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments: Further Amendments made: Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1021

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Report from the Committee of selection, That the Lord Hylton be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Monk Bretton; read, and agreed to 1021

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—5 petitions in favour of; Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1021

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Education (Building Grants (Appropriation Acts, 1907 and 1908, Civil Services, Class IV., Vote 1)).—Further statement showing the cases in which the Board of Education have received applications from local education authorities for special grants for the building of new public elementary schools, and the stage which each case had reached on 31st October, 1908 1021

Natal.—Further correspondence relating to the trial of certain natives in Natal 1022

Irish Land Purchase Acts.—Return giving, by counties and provinces, the area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase money of (*a*) land sold, and (*b*) lands in respect of which proceedings have been instituted and are pending for sale under the Irish Land Purchase Acts; also the estimated area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase money of lands in respect of which proceedings for sale have not been instituted under the said Acts.

Presented and ordered to lie on the Table 1022

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Two Orders, No. 7,605 and No. 7,606, dated 21st November 1908, permitting the landing at the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf, of animals carried on board the ss. "Marquette" and "Minnehaha," respectively 1022

Factory and Workshop.—Schemes for the regulation of hours of employment, intervals for meals and rest, and holidays of workers in charitable institutions approved by the Secretary of State, in pursuance of the powers conferred on him by Section 5 (2) (*a*) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1907.

Laid before the House and ordered to lie on the Table. 1022

SUNDAY LABOUR IN THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

Lord Muskerry 1022

Moved, "That the prevalence of Sunday labour in the mercantile marine, in so far as it relates to British ships when lying in port both at home and abroad, warrants consideration at the hands of His Majesty's

Government with a view to measures being taken towards ensuring that those serving on British ships shall, so far as is reasonably possible, be relieved from work on the Sabbath Day."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

The Earl of Mayo 1028
The Earl of Meath 1028
The Lord Bishop of Liverpool 1029
Lord Lyveden 1030
The Lord Bishop of Bangor 1030
Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 1030
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1032
Lord Muskerry 1033

On Question.

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 22; Not Contents, 47.

Children Bill.—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª.

The Lord Steward (Earl Beauchamp.) 1035

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 31, after the word, 'thereunder' to insert the words 'Subject as aforesaid, this part of this Act shall apply to an infant whose nursing and maintenance has been undertaken for reward before the passing of this Act, in like manner as it applies to an infant whose nursing and maintenance has been so undertaken after the commencement of this Act, and as if any notice given under the Infant Life Protection Act, 1897, had been a notice given under this part of this Act.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Verbal Amendment to Clause 3 agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 11, line 6, to leave out the word 'notoriously,' and to insert the word 'known.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

The Earl of Donoughmore 1036

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 23, line 14, after the word 'person,' to insert the following new subsection: '(3) This part of this Act shall apply in the case of a child or young person who has before the commencement of the Act been committed to the care of a relative or other fit person by an order made under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904, as if the order had been made under this part of the Act.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 1027

Amendment moved—

"In page 30, line 29, to leave out the words 'Court of summary jurisdiction,' and to insert the words 'Petty Sessional Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 1037

Nov. 30.] *Page*

Drafting Amendments to Clause 74 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 1037

Amendment moved—

"In page 43, lines 17 and 18, to leave out the words 'in the school in which he is for the time being detained,' and to insert the words 'in the event of his transfer to another certified school.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 92 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 1038

Amendment moved—

"In page 65, line 2, after the word 'Treasury,' to insert the following new subsection: '(6) Where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that arrangements cannot be made for the purpose of complying with this section in any place by the first day of April, nineteen hundred and nine, the Secretary of State may by order postpone the coming into operation of this section as respects that place until such date, not later than the first day of January, nineteen hundred and ten, as may be specified in the order.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 114 agreed to.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1039

Drafting Amendments to Clause 74 agreed to.

The Earl of Onslow 1039
Earl Beauchamp 1040

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.
Earl Beauchamp 1040

Amendment moved—

"In page 66, line 36, after the word 'Part,' to insert the following new subsection: (3) Without prejudice to the requirements of the Education Acts, 1870 to 1907, as to school attendance or to proceedings thereunder, this section shall not apply during the months of April to September, inclusive, to any child whose parent or guardian is engaged in a trade of such a nature as to require him to travel from place to place, and who has obtained a certificate of having made not less than two hundred attendances at a public elementary school during the months of October to March immediately preceding, and the power of the Board of Education to make regulations with respect to the issue of certificates of due attendance for the purposes of the Education Acts, 1877 to 1907, shall include a power to make regulations as to the issue of certificates of attendance for the purposes of this section.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

Earl Russell 1040

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"After the word 'trade,' to insert the words 'or business.'"—(*Earl Russell.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Donoughmore... 1041
Earl Beauchamp 1041

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Lord Monkswell 1041

Amendments moved—

> "In page 66, after Clause 119, to insert the following new clause: '(1) The holder of the licence of any licensed premises shall not allow a child to be at any time in the bar of the licensed premises, except during the hours of closing. (2) If the holder of a licence acts in contravention of this section, or if any person causes or procures, or attempts to cause or procure, any child to go to or to be in the bar of any licensed premises except during the hours of closing, he shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding, in respect of the first offence, forty shillings, and in respect of any subsequent offence, five pounds. (3) If a child is found in the bar of any licensed premises, except during the hours of closing, the holder of the licence shall be deemed to have committed an offence under this section unless he shows that he has used diligence to prevent the child being admitted to the bar. (4) Where any person is charged with an offence under this section in respect of a child who is alleged in the charge to be under the age of fourteen, and the child appears to the Court to be under that age, the child shall be deemed to be under that age unless the contrary is shown. (5) Nothing in this section shall apply in the case of a child who is resident but not employed in the licensed premises or in the case of premises constructed, fitted, and intended to be used in good faith for any purpose to which the holding of a licence is merely auxiliary. (6) In this section the bar of licensed premises means any open drinking bar or any part of the premises exclusively or mainly used for the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquor."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

Earl Beauchamp 1042

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

> "To leave out subsection (4), and to insert the following new subsection: (7) The expressions "licence" and "licensed premises" have the same meaning as in the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendmentto the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 1042

Amendment moved—

> "In page 69, line 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'Before making any order under this Act with respect to,' and to insert the words 'Where a person is brought before any Court, whether charged with an offence or not, and it appears to the Court that he is.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 128 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 1043

Amendment moved—

> "In page 72, line 22, after the word 'fund,' to insert the words 'as respects the City of London, mean the Common Council and the fund out of which the expenses of the City police are defrayed, and elsewhere.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 75, line 34, after the word '1864,' to insert the words and the reference to the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906, as a reference to the Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903, provided that the expression "holder of a licence" means holder of a certificate under the last mentioned Act.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1044

Amendment moved—

> "In page 81, line 16, to leave out from the word 'shall' to the end of the subsection, and to insert the words 'extend to any person who undertakes for reward the nursing and maintenance of such infants only as are boarded out with him by some religious or charitable society or institution approved by the Local Government Board for Ireland.' "—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Privilege Amendments agreed to.

Moved "That the Bill do now pass."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill passed, and returned to the Commons, and to be printed as amended. [No. 233]

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 30TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Hastings Harbour Bill.—As amended, considered.

Ordered, "That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.' "—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Kings Consent signified. Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 1044

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Wednesday 1044

PETITIONS.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.—Petition for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1044

Tilonko.—Petition of Tilonko, a Chief of the Embo tribe of Zulus, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table 1044

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Natal.—Further Correspondence relating to the Trial of certain Natives in Natal; to lie upon the Table 1045

Page

Factory and Workshop (Schemes for Regulation of Hours of Employment, Etc., in Charitable Institutions).—Schemes for the Regulation of Hours of Employment, intervals, and holidays of workers in Charitable Institutions, approved by the Secretary of State in pursuance of the powers conferred on him by the Factory and Workshop Act, 1907; to lie upon the Table 1045

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order, No. 7605, permitting the landing at the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the s.s. "Marquetto"; to lie upon the Table 1045

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—An Order, No. 7606, dated 21st November, 1908, permitting the landing at the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the s.s. "Minnehaha"; to lie upon the Table 1045

Poor Relief (England and Wales).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 340] 1045

Local Taxation Returns (England and Wales).—The Annual Local Taxation Returns for 1906–7. Part II.; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 333] 1045

Irish Land Purchase Acts.—Return giving by Counties and Provinces the area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase money of (*a*) Lands sold; and (*b*) lands in respect of which proceedings have been instituted and are pending for sale under the Irish Land Purchase Acts; also the estimated area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase money of lands in respect of which proceedings for sale have not been instituted under the said Acts; to lie upon the Table 1046

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Old-Age Pensions Regulations 1046

Extra Police in County Galway 1046

Irish Land Stock 1047

Restoration of the Sigginshaggard Evicted Tenants 1048

Land for Evicted Tenants on the Douglas Estate 1049

Share of Bog Land on Irish Estates 1049

Administration of Tubrid School, County Fermanagh 1050

Irish Land Purchase Prices... 1051

Police Protection of Mr. Lewis of County Galway 1051

Eviction of Mr. Walsh of Kilmurry, County Kerry 1052

Bonus on Irish Land Purchase Agreements 1052

Kneller Hall Training for Army Musicians attached to Regiments Serving Abroad 1053

Official Board of Arbitration 1053

Hours of Drivers and Firemen on Midland Great Western Railway 1054

American Gooseberry Mildew Fungicides 1055

Work for Unemployed on Hackney Marshes 1056

Work for Unemployed at Poplar 1056

Second Division Clerkship Examinations... 1056

Proposed Purchase of Disused Coastguard Station at Fethard by New Ross Board of Guardians 1057

Nov. 30.] Page

Civil Service Pensions—Widows and Orphans 1058
Railway Companies Contributions to Local Rates... 1058
Old-Age Pensions in Scotland—Issue of Regulations in Gaelic 1059
Civil Rights of Christian Converts from the Hindu Religion 1059
Evicted Tenants—Case of Myles Sweeney 1060
Purchase of the Deering and Quinton Duke Estate at Dunmore... 1061
Rents on the Roderick O'Connor Estate 1061
Irish Junior Assistant Teachers Standard of Efficiency 1061
Purchase of Colonel Blake's Estate at Carnacon 1062
Delay in Purchase of State at Caploughlan 1062
Sentence on Patrick Sweeney 1063
Payment of Salaries of Irish National School Teachers 1063
Sale of the Jordan Estate at Cloanmore 1064
Drainage of the River Robe 1064
Count Blake Estate, County Mayo 1065
Begley Estate, Iskerlavally 1065
Asquisition of Sir Compton Domville's Estate 1065
Sons of Head Constables and Cadetships in Royal Irish Constabulary 1066

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Portsmouth Government Contracts and Fair Wages 1066
Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve 1068
Sunday Labour at Rosyth 1069
Coastguards Stations in the Isle of Wight 1069
Distribution and Cavalry 1070
Insanitary Barracks... 1071
The Irish Command... 1071
New Field Howitzer 1072
Canadian Immigration Law 1072
British Indians in Transvaal Prisons 1072
The Charges against Dinizulu 1073
Colonial Immigration Laws 1073
Consular Reports on Industrial Development 1072
The Lado Enclave—Destruction of Elephants 1074
Old-Age Pensions—Claimants over Seventy Years of Age 1076
Married Women and Old-Age Pensions 1076
Unestablished Service and Pensions 1077
Old-Age Pensions Regulations 1077
Unredeemed Banknotes 1078
Privileged Cabs at Woolwich Arsenal Station 1078
The Treatment of Suffragist Prisoners 1079
The Press and Coroners' Courts 1079
Chelmsford Election Disturbances 1081
Dangerous Performances on the Stage 1083

Page
The "All-Red" Route 1083
Foreign Prison Made Goods 1084
North British Railway Company and their Employees 1084
Old-Age Pensions Disqualifications 1086
Notification of Consumption 1087
Liverpool Distress Relief Works 1088
Local Loans 1088
Telegraphic Communication with the Orkneys 1088
Adult Night Messengers in the Post Office 1089
The Mall Improvements 1089
Grants to Roman Catholic Schools 1090
Royal College of Science, London 1090
Second Division Clerks 1091
Estate Duty Office Clerks 1092
Commissioners of Woods and Forests and Small Holdings 1093
The Board of Agriculture 1093
Secondary Schools in Scotland 1093
Drumkeerin Evicted Tenant 1094
The King-Harman Estate 1094
Waterville (Kerry) Road Scheme 1095
Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill 1096
Branchfield Grazing Farm, Sligo 1096
Ballineraw Evicted Tenant 1097
Rathmagurry Evicted Tenant 1097
Land Purchase in Co. Armagh 1097
Turbary on the King-Harman Estate 1098
Shannon Bridge at Portumna 1099
Loughrea Police 1100
Whyte Blake Estate, Loughrea 1100
Surety Prisoners in Irish Gaols 1100
Irish Poor Law Returns 1101
Deportation of Paupers to Ireland 1101
Sligo, Leitrim and Northern Counties Railway 1102
Killea Post Office 1102
Portumna Postal Service 1103
Queen Anne's Bounty Board 1103
The Peers and Government Bills 1104
The Lado Enclave 1104
Trawling Prevention Bill 1105
The Educational Bill 1105
Business of the House 1105

Lords and Commons.

Notice of Motion.

Mr. Swift MacNeill 1106

Nov. 30.] Page

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Cummittee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :

Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) 1107

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out subsection (1)."—(*Mr. Hunt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'an elementary school' stand part of the clause."

The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) ... 1108
Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester) 1111
Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square) 1111
Mr. Runciman 1112
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 1113
Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1117
Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.) 1119
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1121
Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 1125
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1127
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E) 1128
Mr. Runciman 1131
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1132
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) 1135
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 1136
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1136
Mr. Stuart (Sunderland) 1137
Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1138
Sir George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 1140
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 1144
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1145
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1147
Mr. Asquith 1149
Mr. Hunt 1150

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 211 ; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 420.)

Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1153

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, after the word 'be,' to insert the word 'fully.'"

Question, "That the word 'fully' be there inserted," put, and negatived.

Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1153

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'authority,' to insert the words 'except as hereinafter provided.'"—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Runciman 1161
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 1165
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1170
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 1170

Page

Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 1171
Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.) 1174
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 1178
Mr. Stuart (Sunderland) 1185
Mr. F. E. Smith 1187
Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) 1191
Mr. Gwynn (Galway) 1192
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) 1194
Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham) 1197
Sir William Anson 1200
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) 1202
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1204

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 159 ; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 421.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 27th November, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of Clause 1.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 238 ; Noes, 144. (Division List No. 422.)
Whereupon the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment of Parliamentary Grants to associations of schools in respect of every public elementary school belonging to such associations, and of a Parliamentary Grant in respect of instruction given in special subjects at centres, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to make further provision with respect to Elementary Education in England and Wales."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question put forthwith, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 27th November, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow 1211

North British Railway Order (Confirmation Bill By Order).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [17th November], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1212
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1214

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."
Mr. J. M. Henderson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 1216
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Sir H. Kearley, Devonport) 1216

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Page

Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) ... 1218
Mr. Dundas White (Dumbartonshire) ... 1219

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons."—(*Mr. Younger.*)

Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) ... 1220
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) ... 1222
Mr. Mooney ... 1223
Mr. Morton ... 1224
Mr. Sinclair ... 1225
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) ... 1225
Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie) ... 1227

Question put, and negatived.

Bill to be considered to-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 1st DECEMBER, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Natal.—Papers relating to the case of Mr. Alfred Mangena ... 1229

Labour Statistics.—Twelfth Abstract of Labour Statistics of the United Kingdom, 1906–1907 ... 1229

Irish Teachers Pension Rules, 1879.—Rules under Section 11 of the National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1879 ... 1229

Statistics (Colonies).—Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates in each year from 1893 to 1907. Forty-fifth Number.
Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table ... 1229

Superannuation.—Treasury Minute, declaring that Henry Restall, explosive worker, Royal Laboratory, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate 1229

Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877.—Order in Council giving effect to rules of Court.
Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table ... 1229

Francis Ernest Colenso, Barrister-at-Law.—Petition of; praying for inquiry into his case, and that he may be heard by counsel or at the Bar of the House; read, and ordered to lie on the Table ... 1229

Tilonko, a Chief of a Section of the Embo Tribe of Zulus.—Petition of; praying for inquiry into his case, and that he may be heard by counsel or at the Bar of the House; read, and ordered to lie on the Table ... 1229

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Atkinson ... 1230

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

Lord Denman ... 1232
Lord Ashbourne ... 1232

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, till to-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 1st DECEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Enfranchisement of Women.—2 Petitions for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1233

Licensing Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1233

Monastic and Conventual Institutions.—Petition for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1233

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporation and Companies) Bill [Lords].—Petition against; to lie on the Table 1233

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Board of Trade (Labour Department).—Twelfth Abstract of Labour Statistics of the United Kingdom, 1906–7; to lie upon the Table ... 1234

Foreign Import Duties, 1908.—Statement of the Rates of Import Duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Mexico, Argentine, Japan, China, and Persia upon the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom; to lie upon the Table 1234

Statistical Abstract (Colonies).—Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates; to lie upon the Table 1234

Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877.—Order in Council giving effect to Rules of Court; to lie upon the Table 1234

Irish Teachers Pension Rules, 1879.—Rules under Section 11 of the National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1879; to lie upon the Table ... 1234

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Treasury Minute, declaring that Henry Restall, Explosive Worker, Royal Laboratory, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate; to lie upon the Table 1234

Public Health Regulations as to Food Act, 1907.—The Public Health (First Series—Unsound Food) Regulations (Scotland), 1908; to lie upon the Table 1234

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Act, 1907.—The Public Health (Foreign Meat) Regulations, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 1235

Treaty Series (No. 31, 1908).—Accessions of British Colonies, etc., to the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria; to lie upon the Table 1235

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order No. 7610, dated 25th November, 1908, permitting the landing at Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the ss. "Minneapolis"; to lie upon the Table 1235

National Education (Ireland).—Return ordered, relative to National Education in Ireland, showing 1235

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Bill—School Attendance 1236

Colwyn Bay Pier 1236

Dec. 1.] *Page*

New Scottish Fishery Cruiser 1237
Lighting of the Coast of Ross-shire 1237
Blake Estate, County Galway—Case of William Ford 1237
The House of Commons and Foreign Treaties 1238
Roscommon Agricultural and Technical Committee 1239
John Bass's Charity at Birstall 1239
Sleeping Accommodation for Irish Farm Labourers Working in England ... 1240
Unemployed Distress at Southwick-on-Wear 1241
Hop Industry—Recommendations of the Select Committee 1241
Old-Age Pensions Regulations 1242
Maket House on the Harlech Estate 1242
Use of Bogland on Lord Harlech's Finea Estate 1242
Reinstatement of Francis McGuinness on the Tottenham Estate, County Leitrim 1243
Sale of the Estate of Fleetwood Rynd, County Kildare 1243

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Royal Naval Engineer Officers 1244
Admiralty Contracts with Foreign Firms 1245
H.M.S. "Gladiator" 1245
H.M.S. "Barfleur" 1246
Isle of Wight Coastguards 1246
Government Proposals for Indian Reform 1248
Outrages in India 1250
Malarial Fever in India 1251
Circulation of Seditious Literature in India 1251
House Accommodation in Calcutta 1251
Famine in the United Provinces of India 1252
British Vice-Consuls in the Congo State 1253
Gun-Running into Afghanistan 1254
Pensions Claimants 1254
Mine Timber 1255
White Phosphorus 1256
Dove Petty Sessions—Alleged Parental Neglect 1256
Building Accidents in Oxford Street 1256
Commission on Meat Trusts 1257
Case of Gertrude Andrews 1257
Old-Age Pensions Regulations 1258
Mitcham Common Improvements 1259
Lynn Corporation Farm 1259
City of London Auxiliary Postmen 1260
Supply of Baskets for the Post Office 1260
Single-Room Schools and the Right of Entry 1260
Foot and Mouth Disease in America 1261
Cattle Imports 1262

Page

Small Holdings—Defaulting Councils 1263
Small Holdings in Hampshire 1264
Second Division Clerks—New Salary Scale 1265
Prosecutions for Corruption... 1265
Outdoor Relief in Scotland 1266
Glasgow Young Men's Christian Association Classes 1266
Poyntzpass Sewerage 1267
Countess of Charlemont's Armagh Estate 1267
Irish Land Purchase... 1268
Chapman Estate, Westmeath 1268
Limerick Labourers' Cottages 1269
Roscommon Pensions Committee 1269
Irish Female Schools 1270
Food Analysis in County Cavan 1271
Cashel Disturbances... 1271
Ely Estate, Wexford 1273
Newbawn Evicted Tenant 1274
Colonel Gascoigne's Tenantry 1274
Broughal Evicted Tenant 1275
Government Boards... 1275

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to, Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill, with Amendments 1276

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 2:

Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 1276

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out subsection (1)."—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Where the' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 1279
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1284
Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich) 1290
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1298
Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 1300
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1304
Sir Francis Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 1305
Sir Philip Magnus (London University) 1309
Mr. Llewelyn Williams (Carmarthen District) 1311
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1313
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1316
Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.) 1316
The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) ... 1319
Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) 1320

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 239; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 423.)

Mr. Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 1323

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 20 and 21, to leave out the words 'public elementary school provided by the local education authority,' and to insert the words 'transferred voluntary school.'"—(*Mr. Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Runciman 1328

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 273; Noes, 56. (Division List No. 424.)

Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle under Lyne) 1333
Sir Francis Powell... 1333

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 21, to leave out the word 'desires,' and insert the words 'expresses a desire that.'"—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'desires' stand part of the clause."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Trevelyan, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 1334
Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's Hanover Square) 1335
Mr. Runciman 1336
Lord R. Cecil 1336
Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 1338
Mr. Runciman 1338
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 1339
Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) 1341

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2 line 21, to leave out from the word 'instruction,' to the word 'make,' in line 27, and to insert the words 'the authority shall.'"—(*Sir W. J. Collins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'that,' in line 22, stand part of the clause."

The Attorney-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 1341
Sir William Anson 1343
Lord R. Cecil 1343
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) 1345
Mr. Lyttelton 1346
Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.) 1347
Mr. Forster 1348
Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham) 1348
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 1350
Mr. Massie (Wiltshire, Cricklade) 1351
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) 1351
Mr. Llewelyn Williams 1352
Mr. Hudson (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 1355
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1355
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool 1357
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1359
Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester) 1359
Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1361
Mr. Runciman 1361
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1362

Mr. P. Barlow (Bedford) ... 1362
Mr. Clement Edwards (Denbigh Districts) ... 1363
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) ... 1366

Amendment negatived.

Lord R. Cecil ... 1367

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, to leave out from the word 'which' to the second word 'the,' in line 24, and to insert the words 'the local education authority gives or proposes to give in such school.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part."

Sir W. Robson ... 1368
Mr. James Hope ... 1368
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) ... 1369
Lord R. Cecil ... 1369
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) ... 1370
Sir W. Robson ... 1372

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil) ... 1372

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, to leave out the word 'shall,' and insert the word 'may.'"—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Runciman ... 1373
Mr. Radford (Islington, E.) ... 1373
Mr. Clement Edwards ... 1375
Mr. Carlisle ... 1375
Mr. Adkins ... 1376

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 282; Noes, 18. (Division List No. 425.)

Mr. Cave ... 1379

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'provide suitable accommodation.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Runciman ... 1381
Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 1382
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) ... 1383
Mr. Runciman ... 1384
Mr. Lough ... 1385

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil ... 1386

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'instruction,' to insert the words 'upon the same conditions, save as in this Act mentioned, as any other religious instruction given in the school.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson ... 1387
Lord R. Cecil ... 1388

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. James Hope ... 1388

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'instruction,' to insert the words 'in a class of reasonable size.'"—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord R. Cecil 1389

Amendment, by leave withdrawn.

Mr. Mildmay (*Devonshire, Totnes*)... 1389

And, it being Eleven of the Clock the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill [LORDS.]—Read a second time.
Bill Committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—*Mr. Joseph Pease.*) 1392

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 2ND DECEMBER, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Treaty Series. No. 31 (1908).—Accessions of British Colonies, etc., to the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria 1393

Foreign Import Duties 1908.—Statement of the rates of import duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Mexico, Argentina, Japan, China, and Persia, upon the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom.

Presented and ordered to lie on the Table 1393

Diseases of Animals Acts 1894 to 1903.- Orders permitting the landing of animals—

No. 7,608 at Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf (ss. "Crown Point.")

No. 7,608 at Birkenhead Foreign Animals Wharf (ss. "Armenian.")

No. 7,610 at Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf (ss. "Minneapolis.")

No. 7,611 at a Foreign Animals Wharf in Great Britain (ss. "Manchester Trader.") 1393

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1906.—Order in Council, exempting German ships when in British ports from the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, relating to overloading upon certain conditions ... 1393

Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions Act, 1865.—Six Orders in Council under the Act 1393

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Act, 1907.—Public Health (Foreign Meat) Regulations (Scotland), 1908. Public Health (First Series, Uusound Food) Regulations (Scotland), 1908 1394

Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906.—Workmen's Compensation Rules, 1908, (No. 2), dated 24th November, 1908 1394

Page

Penal Servitude Acts, 1853–1891 (Conditional Licence).—Licence granted by His Majesty to Emma Byron, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Lady Henry Somerset Home, Duxhurst, Reigate.

Laid before the House and ordered to lie on the Table 1394

House of Lords.—Report from the Select Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee and an Appendix) made, and to be printed. [No. 234] ... 1394

Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.], and Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.], and the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], That the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], ought to be allowed to proceed. The said Report (with the Proceedings of the Committee), to be printed. [No. 235.] Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out; Bill reported with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. [No. 236.] ... 1394

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Viscount Galway 1394
Lord Belper 1397
The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1400
Viscount Midleton 1404
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh 1405
Viscount Galway 1406
The Chancellor of the Duchy (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) 1406

Incest Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Bishop of St. Albans 1408

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Albans.*)

The Lord Steward (*Earl Beauchamp*) 1409
Earl Russell 1410
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1411
The Earl of Crewe 1411

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

THE ALIENS ACT.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1412

Moved, "That there be laid before the House Papers relating to the administration of the Aliens Act."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Earl Beauchamp 1415
Viscount Ridley 1416
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1417

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1418
The Earl of Crewe 1422
Lord Newton 1423
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1425

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 2ND DECEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Lords' Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered and agreed to 1425

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday 1425

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1425

MONASTIC AND CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS.—Petition for legislation; to lie upon the Table... 1425

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).—Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of The Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of July 1908 on duty on the Railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time; or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours, were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours rest; to lie upon the Table 1426

Statistical Abstract (Foreign Countries).—Statistical Abstract for the principal and other Foreign Countries; to lie upon the Table 1426

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906,—Copy of the Workmen's Compensation Rules, 1908 (No. 2) 1426

Land Purchase Prices (Ireland).—Return ordered 1426

Factory and Workshop (Schemes for Regulation of Hours of Employment).—Paper to be printed. [No. 341.] 1427

Dublin Metropolitan Police.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 342] 1427

Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions Act, 1895.—Six Orders in Council under the Act; to lie upon the Table 1427

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 and 1906.—Order in Council, exempting German ships when in British ports from the provisions of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, relating to overloading, upon certain conditions; to lie upon the Table 1428

Penal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Licence granted by His Majesty to Emma Byron, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Lady Henry Somerset Home, Duxhurst, Reigate; to lie upon the Table 1428

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order No. 7608 permitting the landing at the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the ss. "Crown Point"; to lie upon the Table 1429

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order No. 7609, permitting the landing at Birkenhead Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the ss. "Armenian"; to lie upon the Table 1429

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order No. 7611, permitting the landing at a Foreign Animals Wharf in Great Britain of Animals carried on board the ss. "Manchester Trader"; to lie upon the Table 1429

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Import Duties on British Salt abroad 1429
Isle of Ely Small Holdings Committee and Co-operative Associations 1430
Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the United States 1431
New Lighthouse Sites 1430
Flooding of Irish Rivers 1435
Women Clerks in the Foreign Office 1435
Persons Prosecuted for Corrupt Municipal Administration 1435
British Subjects and the Berne Copyright Union... 1436
Irish Agricultural Exports 1436
Postage Rates for Australian Newspapers... 1437
Closing of Foreland Coastguard Station 1437
Payment of Salaries of Irish National School Teachers 1438
Indian Telegrams 1439
Evicted Tenants in County Westmeath 1439
Sale of the Estate of John H. Beinn, of Creenelea... 1439
Evicted Tenants in County Sligo 1440
Completion of Sale of the Verschoyle Estate at Tanrago... 1441
Sale of the Hazelwood Demesne Estate of Owen Wynne... 1441
Untenanted Lands on the Gore-Booth Estate 1442
Fixing of Second Term Rents on Joint Holdings... 1442
Salaries and Allowances of County Inspectors, Royal Irish Constabulary, stationed in County Galway 1443
Charge for Extra Police 1443
Acquisition of Lands of Aughacreira and Moydristian 1443

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Contracts in Jarrow 1444
Navy Rum Supplies... 1444
Isle of Wight Coastguard Stations... 1445
Coastguard Conference Report 1446
Wages on Admiralty Contracts at Portsmouth 1447
Oats for Army Horses 1449
The Inniskilling Dragoons 1450
Soldiers as Bootmakers 1451
Canadian Immigration—Glasgow Boiler-Makers' Grievance 1452
Workington Conviction for Stealing Coal 1452
Caledonian Railway—Owners' Risk 1453
Seamen's Boarding Houses... 1454
Manning of the Mercantile Marine 1455
Insurance against Unemployment 1457

Dec. 2.] *Page*

Wages and Old Age Pensions 1458
Relief Works and Disfranchisement 1459
Inspection of Fever Hospitals 1460
Betting Temptations for Post Office Employees 1460
Secondary School and Training College Regulations 1461
Walworth Catholic and Council Schools 1462
Attendance in Catholic Schools 1463
Religious and Moral Instruction 1464
Religious Instruction Syllabus 1464
Teachers and the Fair Wages Clause for Contracting-out Schools 1464
Appeals against the Allocation of School Grants 1465
Education Association 1465
Richmond Park 1466
Mall Improvement 1467
Sheriff Clerks in Scotland 1467
The War Trust 1468
Cambridgeshire Small Holdings 1469
Scottish Secondary Schools 1470
Lawlessness in the West of Ireland 1470
Cahirciveen District Council and Fairs 1471
Saurine Estate, Tipperary 1471
Irish Land Purchase Compulsory Powers 1471
Rosse Estate Evicted Tenants 1472
Marsham Estate Evicted Tenant 1472
Irish Equivalent Grants 1473
Kingston Pier Dispute 1473
Minister for Education and Questions 1475

Companies (Consolidation) Bill. [Lords.] **Post Office Consolidation Bill.** [Lords]. **Statute Law Revision Bill.** [Lords.]—Report from the Joint Committee in respect of the Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords] (pending in the Lords), with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 343.] 1475

Debtors (Imprisonment).—Report from the Select Committee brought up, and read, [Inquiry not completed]. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 344.] Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 344.] 1476

Education Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 2:

Mr. Mildmay (*Devonshire, Totnes*) 1476

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out from the word 'instruction,' to the word 'make,' in line 27.'"—(*Mr. Mildmay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'on' stand part of the clause."

The Attorney-General (Sir W. Robson South Shields) 1480
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 1482
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 1485
Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester) 1488
Mr. Massie (Wiltshire, Cricklade) 1489
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) 1490
Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) 1491
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 1492
Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham) 1492
Mr. George Roberts (Norwich) 1494
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1495
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) 1497
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1499
Mr. Walters (Sheffield, Brightside) 1501
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1503
Mr. W. Benn (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) 1503
Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) 1505
The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) ... 1506
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1507
Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.) 1509
Mr. Walter Guinness (Bury St. Edmunds) 1510

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 269; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 426.)

Sir Berkeley Sheffield Lincolnshire, Brigg) 1513

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the first word 'on,' to insert the word 'any.'"—*Sir Berkeley Sheffield.*

Question proposed, "That the word 'any' be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 1515
Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 1515
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1516

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Yoxall 1517

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'two' to insert the word "appointed.'"...(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'appointed' be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 1517

Amendment negatived—

Lord R. Cecil 1517

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out the first word 'the' and insert the word 'each.'"—*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'each' be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester) 1518

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 27, after the word 'meets,' to insert the words 'for twelve calendar months thereafter.'"—*Mr. Essex.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Ashley	1518

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 27, to leave out from the word 'meets,' to the end of the subsection, and insert the words 'provide suitable accommodation in or adjoining the schoolhouse.'"—(*Mr. Ashley*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'make' stand part of the clause."

Sir W. Robson	1519
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University)	1521
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs)	1522
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley)	1523
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Trevelyan, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland	1525
Mr. Austen Chamberlain	1528
Sir George White (Norwich)	1529
Mr. Wyndham (Dover)	1531
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan)	1532
Mr. Napier	1533
Mr. Rawlinson	1533

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 307 ; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 427.)

And it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded in pursuance of the Order of the House of 27th November, successively to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of the Amendments moved by

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."
The Committee divided :—Ayes, 276 ; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 429.)
Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress ; and ask leave to sit again"—*Mr. Runciman*—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].—Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment of Parliamentary Grants to associations of schools in respect of every public elementary school belonging to such associations, and of a Parliamentary Grant in respect of instruction given in special subjects at centres, in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to make further provision with respect to Elementary Education in England and Wales."

Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Trevelyan	1547

Motion made, and Question proposed "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. John Redmond (Waterford)	1548
Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's Hanover Square)	1555
Sir George White	1559
Mr. Dillon	1562
Mr. Runciman	1567
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central)	1580
Sir Wm. Anson	1583

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 244 ; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 430.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nineteen minutes before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, THURSDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 1908.

PETITIONS.

Education Scotland Bill.—Petition for Amendment of ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table... 1593

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Statistics (Foreign Countries).—Statistical abstract for the principal and other foreign countries in each year from 1896 to 1905-1906 1593

Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).—Return in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, presented, and ordered to lie on the Table 1593

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order No. 7619, permitting the landing at a Foreign Animals Wharf in Great Britain of animals carried on board the s.s. "Titian"... 1593

Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907.—Order, 1908, entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Wisbech and District) Order of 1908." Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table 1593

Law of Distress Amendment Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order).

Lord Atkinson 1594

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 15, to leave out the words 'lease, under-lease, or.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 3 agreed to.

Lord Atkinson 1594

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 32, to leave out from the word 'Corporation' to the word 'Provided' in line 37."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Atkinson 1594

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, lines 40 and 41, to leave out the words, "the under tenant or other persons not being the immediate tenant of."—(*Lord Atkinson.*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 41, after the word 'landlord' to insert the words 'or any under tenant or other such person as aforesaid.'"—*Lord Atkinson.*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 4, line 2, to leave out the word 'premises' and to insert the word 'goods,' and after the word 'by,' to insert the word 'subsection.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 5, agreed to.

Lord Courteney of Penwith ... 1595
Lord Avebury ... 1595
Lord Atkinson ... 1596

Amendment moved—

> "In page 4, line 18, after the word 'rent' to insert the words 'whether the same has already accrued due or not.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Atkinson ... 1596

Amendment moved—

> "In page 4, line 25, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'wherever and so far as this Act applies.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment to Clause 9 agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 4, line 32, after the word 'Scotland' to insert the words 'and shall only apply in Ireland to a rent issuing out of lands or tenements situate wholly within the boundaries of a municipality or of a township having town commissioners."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next, and to be printed as amended. (No. 237.)

Incest Bill.—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee ... 1597

THE STRENGTH OF THE ARMY.

The Earl of Erroll ... 1597

Moved, that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to a statement reported to have been made by the Secretary of State for War on Friday the 20th November, at Guildford, to the effect "that the Army was 90,000 stronger than it was three years ago."—(*The Earl of Erroll.*)

The Under-Secretary of State for War (Lord Lucas) ... 1601
Viscount Midleton ... 1604
The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) ... 1607
The Marquess of Lansdowne ... 1609
Lord Lucas ... 1611

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

The Earl of Onslow ... 1612
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Earl Carrington) 1615
Lord Monk Bretton ... 1619
The Earl of Kimberley ... 1619
Earl Carrington ... 1620

House adjourned at ten minutes past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 and 1903.—Order No. 7619, permitting the landing at a Foreign Animals Wharf in Great Britain of Animals carried on board the ss. "Titian"; to lie upon the Table 1620

Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907.—Order, entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Wisbech and District) Order of 1908"; to lie upon the Table 1620

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Lunacy.—Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the Visitors of Lunatics during the six months ending on 30th September, 1908 ... 1620

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Land Purchase 1621
Women Clerks and Inspectors in the Home Office 1621
Loss of the "Spartan Prince" 1621
Spanish Crew of the Steamer "Cartsdyke" 1622
Evicted Tenants—Delay in Reinstatement of Mrs. Margaret Rice 1623
Illegal Trawling in Dundrum Bay 1623
Privileged Cabs at Woolwich Station 1623
Compensation under Licensing Act, 1904 1624
Procedure in County Courts 1624
Wages Dispute at Grangemouth 1625
The Press and Coroners' Courts 1625
Case of J. J. Jelly of Workington 1627
Rent of Teachers' House in Elementary Schools 1627
Cooper School, Marston Sina 1628
Elementary Education—Administrative and Loan Charges 1628
Cost of Medical Inspection of Schools 1628
Secondary Schools and Training Colleges 1629
Out-Relief Administration at Wavertree 1629
Law Officers of the Crown and Old Age Pensions 1630
Distress at Grays Thurrock 1630
Loughborough Distress 1631
Wimbledon Distress 1631
Chiswick Distress 1631
Brentford Distress 1632
Harrogate Distress 1632
Stoke-on-Trent Distress 1632
Folkestone Distress 1632
Memoranda on Fiscal Policy 1633
Irish Old-Age Pension Claimants 1633

Dec. 3.]

Page
Registration of Births in Ireland ... 1633
Pensions and Profits on Small Holdings ... 1634
Irish Taxation ... 1635
London Education Grant ... 1635
Pension Regulations ... 1635
Poor Relief Disqualification ... 1636
Census of Production Returns ... 1636
Pay of Old Age Pension Officers ... 1637
Fruit Tree Washes ... 1637
Fines on Pension Officers ... 1637
War Office Tailors ... 1638
Volunteer Decorations ... 1638
Territorial Efficiency Medal ... 1639
Re-enlistments ... 1640
Musketry Training Committee ... 1640
Army Boot Contracts ... 1640
Musketry Practice ... 1643
Territorial Ranges ... 1643
Use of Wind Gauge in Musketry Practice ... 1644
Hayti Revolt ... 1644
Grehan Estate, Banteer ... 1644
Dublin Assistant Teachers ... 1645
White Estate in Leitrim ... 1646
Longford Pass Evicted Tenants ... 1646
Knockaderry Evicted Tenants ... 1646
Indian Army Charges ... 1647
Irish Railway—Cattle Transit ... 1648
Railway Coupling Accidents ... 1648
Poor Relief and Pensions ... 1649
Hampstead Town Hall ... 1650
Poor Relief and Pensions ... 1651
Parliament Buildings ... 1652
Assistant Surveyor of Taxes ... 1652
H.M.S. "Barfleur" ... 1652
Servian Parcels Post ... 1653
Schedule A and Rating Valuations ... 1653
Valuation of Securities of the Post Office Savings Bank ... 1654
Infantry Battalions ... 1654
Military Expenditure of the Great Powers .. 1656

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Contract for Protected Cruisers ... 1657
Unarmoured Cruiser Contracts ... 1658
Anti-Torpedo Destroyer Armaments ... 1659

Dec. 3.]

Page

The New Destroyers 1659
Trials of New Destroyers 1660
Admiralty Contracts 1660
Dockyard Employees 1662
Anarchist Outrages in India 1662
Tampering with Indian Native Troops 1663
Indian Army Pay 1664
Indian Army Charges 1664
South Nigerian Expedition 1665
Boycotting of British Indians in the Transvaal 1666
Colonial Immigration Regulations 1666
Sleeping Sickness in Horses 1666
British Indians and Transvaal Registration Laws 1667
Hong Kong Riots 1668
British Indians in the Transvaal 1668
Shangai Opium Conference 1669
Disturbances in Hayti 1669
The Lado Enclave 1670
Destruction of African Wild Game 1670
Colonel Leakhoff's Position at Teheran 1671
British Ports 1671
Political Contributions by Railway Companies 1673
Illegal Insurance Policies 1673
Port of Liverpool 1674
North Ronaldshay Lighthouse 1674
Colonial Tariffs 1675
British Magazine for Canada 1676
Christmas Pay in the Post Office 1676
Telephone Communication in Gloucestershire 1677
The New Education Bill 1677
Co-operative Societies and Small Holdings 1678
English Agricultural Grant 1679
American Gooseberry Mildew 1679
Inspectors under the Insects and Pests Act 1680
Carnarvon Farmers' Association 1681
The Spraying of Fruit Trees 1681
Fruit Tree Pests 1682
Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Small Holdings... 1682
Sheriff Substitutes 1683
Deputy Sheriff Clerks 1684
Dunleer Allotments 1685
Mearscourt Estate, Westmeath 1686
State Purchase of Irish Railways 1686
Fuge Estate, Cork 1686

Dec. 3.] Page

Edenderry Labourers' Cottage Scheme 1687
Waterville Lake Fishing Industry 1688
Calnbeck Estate, Queen's County 1688
Irish Landlords' Sporting Rights 1689
Warning to Nationalist Newspapers 1689
Poor Law Reform (Ireland) Bill 1690
Irish Workhouse Teachers' Salaries 1690
Ballyscullion Police Hut 1691
Illicit Distillation in County Antrim 1691
Alleged Malicious Burning at Knodsmay 1691
Land Purchase in Munster 1693
Holycross Disturbances 1694
Intermediate Education Inspectors... 1695
Firearms in Ireland 1697
Attack on Gurteen Police Patrol 1698
Irish Education Grant 1698
Sales under the 1903 Land Act 1698
Ormanthwaite Evicted Tenents 1699
Ardfert Estate, North Kerry 1699
Cavan and Leitrim Railway 1700
Dundrum Bay Fisheries 1701
Irish Trade Frauds 1701
Irish Agricultural Grant 1702
The Gurteen Disturbances 1703
Irish Stationery Office Contracts 1703
Rathmoyle Letter Delivery... 1704
Killmessan and Robinstown Postal System 1704
The Archbishop of York 1705
Poor Law Relief Disqualification 1706
Clergy in Parliament 1706
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill 1707
Admission to the Galleries 1707
Business of the House 1707

Housing, Town Planning, Etc. Bill [Title Amended].— Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee B.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 345.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 345]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 386] 1709

Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 346.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 346.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 387.] 1710

New Member Sworn.—Ernest George Pretyman, esquire, for the County of Essex (Mid or Chelmsford Division) 1710

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to: Children Bill, with Amendments 1710

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [Lords.]—Order for Second Reading Read.

The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1710

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1713
Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 1715
Mr. Winfrey (Norfolk, S.W.) 1715
Mr. Herbert Samuel 1716
Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1716
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1717
Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 1718
Mr. Scott (Ashton-under-Lyne) 1719
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1720
Mr. Idris (Flint Boroughs) 1724
Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) 1725
Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs) 1726
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1727
Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead) 1729
Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 1730
Mr. Hedges (Kent, Tonbridge) 1731
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 1732
Mr. B. S. Straus (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) 1733
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1736
Captain Craig (Down, E.) 1737
Mr. Herbert Samuel 1741
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1744

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill.—As amended (in the Standing Committee) considered.

Earl of Ronaldshay (Middlesex, Hornsey) 1746
Mr. Hicks Beach 1747

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Earl of Ronaldshay.*)

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1747

Mr. Akers Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine's) 1749

Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) 1750

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Earl of Ronaldshay 1751

Mr. Hicks Beach 1752

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, to leave out the word 'eleven,' and to insert the word 'twelve.'"—(*Earl of Ronaldshay.*)

Page

Question proposed, "That the word 'eleven' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Gladstone 1753

Mr Rupert Guinness (*Shoreditch, Haggerston*) 1753

Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 1753

Amendment negatived.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be now read a third time," —(*Mr. Gladstone*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.]—Order for the Second Reading read.

The Attorney-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 1754

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir W. Robson.*)

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House, for To-morrow.—(*Sir W. Robson.*)

Companies Consolidation Bill.—Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Mr. Akers Douglas (*Kent, St. Augustine's*) 1755

The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Churchill, Dundee*) 1755

Question, put and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :

Privilege Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, considered; Bill read the third time and passed with an Amendment 1756

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. J. A. Pease, Essex, Saffron Walden*) 1756

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nineteen minutes after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 4TH DECEMBER, 1908.

The House met at Twelve Noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1757

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1906.—Regulations, entitled the "Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs (General) Regulations, 1908"; to lie upon the Table ... 1757

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—An Order, No. 7617, prohibiting the landing of Animals from the States of Maryland and Delaware, in the United States of America; to lie upon the Table ... 1757

Irish Land Act, 1903.—Instructions to Inspectors, dated 12th November, 1908, supplemental to the Instructions dated 9th March, 1906, issued by the Estates Commissioners under the Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant, dated 5th March, 1906; to lie upon the Table ... 1757

Roads and Bridges (Scotland).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 347.] ... 1757

East India (Customs Revenue)—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 348.] ... 1757

Board of Education.—Return showing the total number of Pupils on 1st October, 1907, in the Schools and Centres included in the List of Secondary Schools in England recognised as efficient, and of recognised Pupil Teacher Centres, 1907–8; to lie upon the Table ... 1757

Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906 (Industrial Diseases).—Order, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 8 (6) of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, extending to certain Industrial Diseases the provisions of Section 8 (subject to modifications) and amending the previous Order of 22nd May, 1907; to lie upon the Table ... 1757

Registration of Firms Abroad.—Reports from Colonial Governors, the Government of India, and His Majesty's Representatives Abroad on Laws and Regulations in force in British Colonies and Possessions in British India and in Foreign Countries respecting the Registration of Commercial Firms; to lie upon the Table ... 1757

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Copy presented, of Rules made by the Board of Trade under the Act; to lie upon the Table ... 1757

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Syllabuses—The Apostles' Creed ... 1757
Voluntary School Grants ... 1759
Royal Naval Reserve—Case of Alfred Rutherford, of Leeds ... 1759
School Teachers' Salaries—Proportion per child ... 1760
Collection of Tea-cess by Indian Government ... 1761
Old-Age Pensions Regulations ... 1762
Charge for Annual Revision of County Westmeath ... 1762
Compulsory Attendance at Contracted-out Schools ... 1763
Sale of Impure Whiskey at Irish Fairs ... 1763
Arbitrators' Charges at Carrick-on-Suir ... 1764

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD SURCHARGES ... 1764

Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendment to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 389] ... 1766

Port of London Bill.—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Churchill, Dundee*) … … 1767

Motion made and Question, "That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of the new clauses standing on the Notice Paper on the 12th day of November last,"—(*Mr. Churchill,*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Mr. Churchill … … … … … … … … 1767

New clause—

"(1) Where the Port Authority propose to construct, equip, maintain, or manage any works, and the works proposed to be constructed are such that they cannot be constructed without statutory authority, or are such that in the opinion of the Board of Trade they ought not to be constructed except under the authority of such an order as is hereinafter mentioned, or compulsory powers are required for the acquisition of land, or it is sought to impose any charges not previously authorised in respect of the use of any works when constructed, the Port Authority may apply to the Board of Trade, and thereupon the Board of Trade may make an order:—(*a*) Authorising the construction and equipment of such docks, quays, wharves, jetties, or piers, and buildings, railways, and other works in connection therewith as may be specified in the order; (*b*) authorising the purchase and taking otherwise than by agreement of such land as may be specified in the order; (*c*) authorising the imposition, levying, collection, and recovery of such dues, rates, tolls, and other charges in respect of the use of any works proposed to be constructed, and conferring such powers of management of those works, as may be specified in the order; (*d*) authorising the Port Authority to charge to capital, as part of the cost of construction of any work authorised by the order, the interest on any money raised to defray the expenses of construction of any such work and the acquisition of land for the purpose, for such period and subject to such restrictions as may be mentioned in the order. Provided that:—(*a*) no land shall be authorised by an order under this section to be acquired compulsorily which is situate to the westward of the meridian six minutes east of Greenwich; and (*b*) an order authorising the construction of new works shall impose on the Port Authority an obligation to provide such housing accommodation for the persons to be employed at the new works when constructed as the Board of Trade may from time to time consider requisite. (2) Any order made under this section authorising the purchase and taking of land otherwise than by agreement shall incorporate the Lands Clauses Acts as if the order was a special Act within the meaning of those Acts. Provided that the Board of Trade may by Provisional Order make such modifications and adaptations of the provisions of the Lands Clauses Acts to be incorporated in an order under this section as may be specified in the Provisional Order. (3) If it appears to the Board of Trade that by reason of the extent or situation of any land proposed to be acquired compulsorily, or the purposes for which such land is used, or any other circumstances, the land ought not to be acquired compulsory without the sanction of Parliament, the order of the Board shall be provisional only and shall not have effect unless confirmed by Parliament."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) ... 1772
Sir Edwin Cornwall (Bethnal Green, N.E.) ... 1776
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) ... 1778
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) ... 1781
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1782
Mr. Russell Rea (Gloucester) ... 1782
Mr. W. Pearce (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) ... 1783
Mr. Walter Guinness (Bury St. Edmunds) ... 1783
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) ... 1785
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1786
Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) ... 1792
Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford) ... 1793
Sir Gilbert Parker ... 1794
Mr. Churchill ... 1794
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) ... 1795
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) ... 1796
Sir Gilbert Parker ... 1800
Mr. Churchill ... 1801
Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing) ... 1801

Question put and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 9, after the word 'thereupon,' to insert the words 'after holding an inquiry at which all persons shall be heard."'—(*Mr. Whitehead*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill ... 1802

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Walter Guinness (Bury St. Edmunds) ... 1803

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words 'or a Provisional Order as provided in this section.'"—(*Mr. Walter Guinness*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill ... 1806
Lord R. Cecil ... 1807
Sir A. Spicer (Hackney, Central) ... 1808
Mr. Renwick ... 1808
Mr. Whitehead ... 1809
Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton) ... 1810
Mr. Bowles ... 1812
Mr. Waterlow, (Islington, N.) ... 1813
Mr. Rowlands ... 1814
Sir F. Banbury ... 1815
Mr. Morton ... 1816
Sir Gilbert Parker ... 1817
Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.) ... 1819
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1820
Sir William Bull (Hammersmith) ... 1822
Mr. Churchill ... 1822
Mr. Walter Guinness ... 1824

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 36; Noes, 185. (Division List No. 431.)

Mr. Whitehead 1827

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 16, after the word 'land,' to insert the words 'and subject to such conditions and reservations.'"—(*Mr. Whitehead.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 31, to insert after the word 'Greenwich,' the words 'or which has been acquired by the owners thereof under statute.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury 1828

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 36, at end, to insert the words 'Provided also that nothing herein contained shall empower the Board of Trade to authorise the purchase and taking of any land belonging to any railway company and used by such company as a part of or in connection with their railway and acquired by such company under any of the provisions of the Acts relating to their undertakings.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 1829

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Churchill 1829

Amendment proposed—

"In line 45, at the beginning of subsection (3) to insert the words 'Before formulating an Order under this subsection the Board of Trade shall appoint an impartial person to hold an inquiry on its behalf.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Gilbert Parker 1829
Mr. Churchill 1830

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"To leave out subsection (3), and to insert the words '(3) Before making an Order under this section the Board of Trade shall appoint an impartial person to hold a public inquiry on their behalf, and if he reports or if it appears to the Board of Trade that by reason of the extent or situation of any land proposed to be acquired compulsorily, or the purposes for which such land is used, or any other circumstances, the land ought not to be acquired compulsorily without the sanction of Parliament the Order of the Board shall be provisional only and shall not have effect unless confirmed by Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words '(4) Any Order other than a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under this section shall not take effect until a draft thereof has lain for thirty days on the Table of both Houses of Parliament, and if either House during those thirty days presents an address to His

Majesty against the draft no further proceedings shall be taken thereon but without prejudice to the making of a new Order.' "—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Mr. Churchill 1831

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, after the word 'days,' to insert the words 'during the session of Parliament.' "—*Mr. Renwick.*

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

Mr. Morton 1831

New clause—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in the Act of 54 Geo. III., c. 159, the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, or any Act amending the same, any rates, dues, tolls, fees, or other charges leviable under this Act, or under any Provisional Order made thereunder, or under any Act incorporated therewith, shall be chargeable to and payable by the Crown upon the same conditions and in the same manner as they are chargeable to and payable by other bodies or persons.' "—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Churchill 1832
Mr. Myer 1832
Mr. Morton... 1832

Proposed new clause negatived.

Mr. Morton... 1832

New clause proposed—

"The following accounts shall be kept separately by the Port Authority in addition to any other accounts which are by this Act prescribed to be kept as separate accounts, that is to say:—(1) An account (to be called the Docks Capital Account) showing: (*a*) The amount of port stock created and issued in substitution for the existing stocks of the dock companies; (*b*) the amount of money expended by the Port Authority on capital account in improving the docks, basins, cuts, and entrances by this Act transferred to the Port Authority or in constructing and equipping new docks, basins, cuts, entrances, and other works or otherwise on capital account in improving the Port of London. (2) An account (to be called the Docks Revenue Account): (*a*) Of all sums received in respect of vessels entering, lying in, departing from, or otherwise using the docks, basins, cuts, or entrances from time to time vested in the Port Authority other than the duties of tonnage prescribed in Section 155 of the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, as amended by Section 7 of the Thames Conservancy Act, 1905, and by this Act and in respect of all goods imported into or exported from such docks, basins, cuts, and entrances, and in respect of services rendered or accomodation provided by the Port Authority within the same and of all other revenue received by the Port Authority in respect thereof (to be called Dock Receipts): (*b*) of all sums expended in respect of the maintenance, management, and improvement of the Port of London, including all sums paid by way of interests on or redemption of money expended on Dock Capital Account (to be called Dock Expenditure). (3) An account (to be called the River Capital

Dec. 4.]

Account) showing: (*a*) the amount of port stock created and issued under this Act in substitution for Thames Conservancy Redeemable 'A' Debenture Stock: (*b*) such amount of the money expended by the Port Authority on capital account as, in the opinion of the auditor of the Port Authority, is capital expenditure necessitated by the requirements of persons and vessels not using the said docks, basins, cuts, and entrances of the Port Authority. (4) An account (to be called the River Revenue Account): (*a*) Of all sums received from the said duties of tonnage and in respect of all vessels, goods, services, and accommodation, other than the vessels, goods, services, and accommodation referred to in subsection (2) (*a*) of this section, and of all other revenue received by the Port Authority (to be called river receipts): (*b*) of all sums paid: (1) by way of interest on or redemption of money expended on River Capital Account: (2) such proportion of the expenditure referred to in subsection (2) (*b*) of this section as, in the opinion of the auditor of the Port Authority, is expenditure necessitated by the requirements of persons and vessels not using the said docks, basins, cuts, and entrances of the Port Authority (to be called river expenditure). (5) The dock expenditure shall defrayed out of the dock receipts and the river expenditure shall be defrayed out of the river receipts, and no portion of the river receipts shall be applied in aid of the dock expenditure."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Churchill 1835
Sir Gilbert Parker 1836
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1838
Mr. Renwick 1839
Mr. Churchill 1840
Mr. Myer 1841

Mr. CHURCHILL rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That the clause be read a second time."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 15; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 432.)

Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

And it being after Five of the Clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the CHAIRMAN proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. CHURCHILL rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House," put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 390.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS (ADMISSION OF STRANGERS).—Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Rules and Regulations under which Strangers are admitted to this House and its precincts; and to report whether any alterations in the same are expedient.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Five o'clock, till Monday next.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXCVII.

ERRATUM.

VOLUME CXCVII.

November 24th.—Sir W. J. Collins' Speech, Column 240, line 17, should read, "which they would have to look forward to."

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JANUARY IN THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 24th November, 1908.

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.

Ordered, That at the future meetings of the Peers of Scotland, assembled under any Royal Proclamation for the election of a Peer or Peers to represent the Peerage of Scotland in Parliament, the Lord Clerk Register, or the Clerks of Session officiating thereat in his name, do call the title of the Lord Fairfax of Cameron according to its place in the roll of Peers of Scotland called at such election and do receive and count the vote of the Lord Fairfax of Cameron claiming to vote in right of the said Barony, and do permit him to take part in the proceedings in such election.

Several Lords took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Leave given to the Select Committee not to sit again till Monday next.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour of: Of Ealing Women's United Temperance Association; Leeds United Working Men's Temperance League; Friar Street Adult School Temperance Society; Carshalton and Wallington United Temperance Committee; Temperance Societies of Longton, Staffordshire; Ilkeston Free Church Council, Public Temperance Meeting; Cynidr Tent, No. 2602, of the Independent Order of Rechabites Friendly Society; Penzance Temperance Federation; Meeting at Bank Street Unitarian Sunday School, Bolton, 19th November, 1908; The following Tents of the Independent Order of Rechabites Friendly

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Society: Beacon, No. 1502, Victoria, No. 1715, Vale of Usk, No. 3502 , Castle, No. 1767, Enig, No. 2484, Mynydd Troed, No. 2094, Cynog, No. 2688, Trfon Valley, No. 3109, Walton, No. 1571; Highgate Park Baptist Church; Townspeople of Goole; Wesley Brotherhood and Sisterhood, Liverpool; Chard Baptist Christian Endeavour Society; Inhabitants of Bootle; Helsby Wesleyan Band of Hope; Helsby Wesleyan Church Society; Helsby Wesley Guild; Helsby Wesleyan Sunday School; Bray Shop Band of Hope Society; United Methodist Church Meeting at Carlingcott, in the county of Somerset, on Sunday, 22nd November, 1908; United Methodist Sunday School Meeting at Carlingcott, in the county of Somerset, on Sunday, 22nd November 1908; Belper Temperance Society; Bristol Central Weslyan Mission Band of Hope Committee; Church of Christ, Fulham Cross; Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting of the Society of Friends; South Manchester Free Church Council; Salisbury and Southampton Temperance Committee; Saron Congregational Church, Aberaman; Free Church Council of Brixham; Members of Church of Christ, Ismailia Hall, Ismailia Road, Fulham; Gunners' Safeguard Lodge of the International Order of Good Templars; Colne Valley Lodge, No. 1,148, of the International Order of Good Templars; Advance Lodge, No. 3,036, of the International Order of Good Templars; Vale of Dovoy Free Church Council; Peoples' Bethel Mission Total Abstinence Society; United Meeting of Society Classes of Collingwood Street, Wesleyan Church; Council and their friends of the Poplar Liberal and Radical Association; Meeting of Women at Tiverton Hall, Garridge Street, Westminster Bridge; Kelvedon Women's Liberal Association; Devon Union Women's Liberal Associations; Hull Associated Shipwrights' Society; Congregational Church of Balham, in the county of Middlesex; Excelsior Lodge International Order of Good Templars; Halifax Citizens' League; Some inhabitants of Liverpool; 12th (Liverpool) Company of the Boys' Brigade and Supporters; Meeting at Cecilville House, Hornsey; Children's Mission Ragged School, Delwood Street, Camberwell; Meeting at Kennington Park; Members and Adherents of Calvinistic Methodist Church at Shrewsbury; Wesleyan Methodist Society and Congregation at Ratcliffe; Committee of Primitive Methodists of the District of Sheffield; West Sleekburn and Stakeford Temperance Festival Association; Barnard Castle Branch of the United Kingdom Railway Temperance Union; Stockton-on-Tees Temperance Society; Liverpool Ladies' Temperance Association; Gospel Blue Ribbon Mission of Derby; Temperance Workers of Babington Ward, Derby; Queens' Road Temperance Society, Wallington; Lowesmoor Temperance Society; Worcester Total Abstinence Society; Dewsbury Temperance Society; Bishop Auckland Temperance Society; Liverpool Unitarian Temperance Association; Society of Friends, Charlbury; United Free Chuch Presbytery, Kirkcudbright; Calvinistic Methodist Church and Congregation, Philadelphia, County Glamorgan; Calvinistic Methodist Church and Congregation, Nazareth Llangammarch Wells; Independent Methodist Church, Crewe; Risley Independent Methodist Church, Warrington; Original Grand Order of the Total Abstinent Sons of the Phœnix, Star of Willenhall Lodge; The International Order of Good Templars (Retford Branch); The United Methodist Church, New Road, Grays, Essex; Upper Wincobank Chapel, Sheffield; A Meeting in the Mission Hall, Leytonstone; A Meeting at the Ossett Temperance Hall; The Ossett Temperance Society Committee; The Wesleyan Men's Bible Class, Bromley; The Guild of Christian Endeavour, Chester; The Committee of the Bromley Women's Liberal Association; A Meeting of the Northampton Women's Liberal Association; The Newquay (Cornwall) Women's Liberal Association; The Congregational Young People's Union, Liskeard; The Whitby Liberal Club; The Bridlington and Quay Temperance Society; The Clifton Temperance Society; The British Temperance Society's Gospel Temperance Union; The South Nutfield Temperance Mission; The following Temperance Societies: Liskeard, Rye, Lake, Chiqual, Tredriggick, Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road, Bolton, Linacre, Northamptonshire Temperance and Band of Hope Union, Canterbury, Lychett Minster;

Of the following Public Meetings at Wesley Chapel, City Road, Marsh Lane, Preston, Pointon, Folkingham, Rafferton, Driffield, Wolverton, Bucks, Loppington, Salop, Dilston Road, Newcastle, Dewen Heath, Salop, Millon, Cumberland, Hodnet, Shropshire, Greenhill, Derby, Victoria Street, Temple Hall, Taunton, Vale Royd, Tunbridge Wells, Mevagissey, Cornwall, Mount Hawke, Cornwall, St. Ives, Cornwall, Falmouth, Cornwall, Nanclearn, Penzance, Lelant, Crantock, Cornwall, Heamoor, Heswall, High Green, Chapeltown, Thetford, Brandon, Tattershall Bridge, Stratford, London, Crows Nest and Menheniot, Liskeard, Wesley Hall, Shildon, Blyton, Neath Abbey, Swansea, Soar Chapel, Talserran, St. Paul's Church (Welsh), Ampthill, Bedfordshire, Newbottle Street, Houghton-le Spring, Crewkerne; Of persons signing at St. Buryan, Penzance, St. Just, Cornwall, William Street, Swindon, Tamworth, Stafford, Rookhope, County Durham, Daventry, Northampton, Swindon Circuit, Burnhope, County Durham, Wearhead, County Durham, Greers Norton, Northampton, Tredegar, Monmouth, Callington, Cornwall, Wesley Chapel, Nottingham, Tredegar (Eastern), Monmouth, Eastgate, Durham, Weardale, Durham, St. John's Chapel, Durham, Brigg, Lincolnshire, Friskney, Lincolnshire, Protas, Cornwall, Pontypridd, Glamorgan, Netherton, Worcester, Brentwood, Essex, Hartford, Cheshire, Lostock Gralaw, Northwich, Acton, near Northwich, Station Road, Northwich, Sandway, Northwich, Little Budworth, Northwich, Over Winsford, Northwich, London, Northwich; Brunswick Society Class; Tranmere Band of Hope; Brunswick Men's Society Class, Sisterhood and Brotherhood, Birkenhead, Pleasant Tuesday Evening, Hind Street, London; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Truro; Executive Free Church Council, Mevagissey; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Walton-le-Dale, Preston; Trustees and Leaders Wesleyan Church, Hucknall Torkard; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Newtown, Wigan; Men's Bible Class, Blackood, Chorley; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Standishgate, Wigan; Temperance Society, Archway Road, London; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Poynton Green; Society Class, Ellerdine; Wesley Guild, Kirbymoorside; Wesley Guild, Cattle Fields, Shrewsbury; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Brynmawr, Nantyglo, Blaina, Beaufort Hill, Abertillery, Cwmtillery, Abergavenny, Crickhowell, Clydach, Llanelly Hill, Llanelly; Tranmere Branch of Wesley Guild; Men's Bible Class and Society Class at Birkenhead; Wesleyan Methodist Meeting, Hugas; Wesleyan Methodist Church, French; Band of Hope, Ebenezer, Plymouth; Missionary Meetings at Market Weighton (2); Bible Class, Standishgate, Wigan; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Hurstbourne; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Overton; Anchor of Hope Club, Whitchurch; Ebenezer Wesleyan Church, Bramley, Leeds; Wesley Guild, Teignmouth; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Aber, Penmaenidcwm; Wesley Guild, Redditch; Band of Hope, Horseshay; Wesley Guild, Madeley; Band of Hope Committee, Earlestown; Stewards of Wesleyan Church, Earlestown; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Haydock; Society Classes at Rodington, Poynton Green; Mothers' Meeting, New Cross; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Tamworth Street, Earlestown; Presbyterian Church, Tamworth Street, Earlestown; Band of Hope, Cefn Coed, Tydvil; Society Class, Wellington; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Bispham, Warsley and Standish, Wigan; Society Class, Hadley; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Standishgate, Wigan; Band of Hope, Old Bolingbroke, Spilsby; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Pendry Mold, Mold; Wesley Guilds at Admaston, Southampton; Society Class, Horsehay, Salop; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Pyke Street, Barry Dock; Wesley Guild, Cowes; Band of Hope, Plymouth; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Worsley; Wesley Guild, Old Elvet; Wesleyan Methodist Churches, Cardiff, Annfield Plain; Temperance Society, St. George's; Wesley Guild, Waltham Abbey; Quarterly Meeting, Central Hall, Birmingham; United Band of Hope, Landrey, Barnstaple; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Chisterton; Sons of Temperance, Hallgate, Coltingham; Wesley Guild, Brompton, North Riding; Gospel Temperance Society, Prince of Wales Road; Office Bearers, Methodist Church, Prince of Wales Road; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Pevensey Road, Eastbourne;

Band of Hope and Society Class, Lanley Bank; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Machynlleth, Montgomery; Women's Society Class and Young Men's Society Class, Poplar; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Cubitt Town; Adult Bible Class and Wesley Guild, Poplar; Men's Meeting, Wesleyan Mission, Old Ford; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Lodock; Leaders Meeting and Circuit Temperance Committee, Nottingham; Women's Meeting, Wesleyan Church, Poplar; Wesley Guilds, Harley Square and Cliftonville, Margate; Society Class, Lawley Bank; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Denholme; Executive of Temperance Association, Coedpoeth, Wrexham; Band of Hope and Temperance Workers, Carver Street, Sheffield; Leaders Meeting, Haltwhistle; Band of Hope, High Street, Glossop; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Bonwell, Newcastle; Sunday School, Cottingham, Hull; Wesleyan Temperance Society, Muswell Hill; Wesley Guilds at Union Street, Accrington and Haltwhistle; Sunday School, West Lane, Haworth; Trustees Meeting, Wesleyan Church, Dorking; Temperance Committee, Methodist Conference; Sunday School Convention, Kilndown; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Shirwell, Barnstaple, and Wilsden; British Women's Temperance Association, Haworth; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Cross-in-Hand; Wesley Guild, Bevoirs Town, Southampton; Society Class, Ketting; Society Class, Blowick, Southport; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Bow; Wesleyan Literary Society, Saddleworth; Band of Hope, Stephen Hill, Crookes; Leaders Meeting, Sholton; Leaders Meeting, Wheatley Hill; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Denton Burn, Newcastle; Wesleyan P.S.A., Rushton; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Denbigh, St. Asaph, Much Wenlock; Ladies Meeting, Tweens Street, Morley; Sunday School Teachers, Gwennap, Redruth; Wesleyan Methodist, Lewisham and Brockley; Brotherhood Meeting, High Street, Plaistow; Wesley Guild, Madeley Wood; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Mount Gold, Plymouth; Men's Society Class, Wealdstone; Presbyterian Church, Houghton-le-Spring, County Durham; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Pontypridd, Hessenford, and Quethiock; Band of Hope, Dowlais; Band of Hope and Choir, Gainsborough; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Ebenezer, Portmadoc, Elsecar; Barnsley, Barthygest, Portmadoc, Birtonwood, Newton-le-Willows; Wesley Guild North End, Newark-on-Trent; Primitive Methodist Sunday School, Earlstown; Society Class, Coton Crescent, Shrewsbury; Wesley Guild, St. Paul's, Bideford; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Lady Margaret Road, Kentish Town; Society Class (Ladies), Dawley; Men's Society Class, Wellington; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Lingfield; Trinity Free Church at Codsall, Stafford; Wesley Guild at Chatteris; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Barnsley; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Holme, Spalding Moor; Leaders and Society Class at Greenfields, Shrewsbury; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Newport; Bolton District Synod Commission at Rochdale; Of the following Wesleyan Methodist Churches: St Mawes, Philleigh, Par, Tywardreath, Fowey, Trenarren, St. Blazengate, Polgorth, St. Austell, Sangeth, St. Austell, Coombe, Sticker, St. Austell, St. Austell, Trewoon, St. Austell, Shalfleet, Freshwater, Galbourne, Merstone, St. David's, Dewbury, Hick's Road, Cambridge, North Cave, Hook, Broomfleet, Towyn, Aberdovey, Beeston, Barnstaple, Lumley, Tondu, Cardiff, St. Athan, Cardiff; Wesley Guild at Blackwater; Wesley Guild at Blackpool; Free Church Meeting, Talbot Road, Blackpool; East End Brotherhood, Clarence Street, Newcastle; Sunday School at Swansea; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Tavistock; Wesley Guild at Warrington; People's Own Meeting at Gateshead; Leaders and Trustees and Sunday School at Harpurhey, Manchester; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Llanfyllin; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Brithdir, Cardiff; Brotherhood Meeting at Stratford, Essex; Wesley Guild at Caistor, Lincolnshire; Sunday School and Band of Hope at Morriston; Executive Committee of District Liberal Club at Rhyl; Wesleyan Methodist Church and Wesley Guild at Beccles; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Society Class (2), Mutual Improvement Society, and Leaders and Stewards, Wesley Guild at Hastings; Wesleyan P.S.A. at Hollington, Derby; Wesleyan Sisterhood at Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Longton, Stafford; Class Meeting at Market Drayton; Wesleyan

Methodist Church at Cardiff; Wesley Guild at Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Radyr, Cardiff; Wesleyan Mission at Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Cærphilly, Cardiff; Wesley Guild at Bedwas; Of the following Wesleyan Methodist Churches: Machen, Monmouth, Risca, Blackwood, Fleur-de-Lis, Cramlir, Port Llanfraith, Llanhilleth, Plas, Maes-y-cwmmer, Cardiff; Young Men's Society Class and Leaders Meeting at Southport; Free Church Council at Holsworthy; Men's Bible Class at Witney; Men's Bible Class at Warrington; Men's Meeting and Wesley Guild at Portswood, Southampton; Wesleyan P.S.A. at Bitterne; Liberal Association at Portswood; Wesley Guild at Bevois Town, Southampton; Pleasant Sunday Afternoon at Bitterne Park; Of the following Wesleyan Methodist Churches: East Grinstead, Crawley Down, Hayward's Heath, Ridgewood, Buxted, East Hoatley, Blackboys, Newhaven, Lewes; Class at Shrewsbury; Adult Bible Class at Waltham Abbey; Free Church Council and Wesleyan Methodist Church at Whitchurch, Hants; Wesleyan Mission at Portsmouth; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Carnarvon; Wesleyan Methodist Church and Wesleyan Temperance Society at Nottingham; Wesley Guild at Shanklin; Annual Circuit Meeting at Southport; Wesley Guild at Earlestown, Lancashire; Wesley Methodist Church at Ashton-in-Makerfield, Lancashire; Wesley Guild and Women's Temperance Society at Salford; Wesley Guild and Men's Meeting at Peckham; Primitive and Wesleyan Men's Bible Class at Earlestown, Lancashire; Young Men's Christian Association at Earlestown; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Iver; Wesleyan Church at North Wallbottle, Northumberland; Wesleyan Mission Band at Homerton; Society Class at Horsehay; Wesley Guild and Men's Meeting at Mapperley; Wesley Brotherhood at Beeston; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Bispham; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Newtown; Men's Bible Class at Standish; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Shrewsbury; Men's Bible Class at Chorley; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Llanarmon; Weslevan Methodist Church at Lincoln; Wesleyan Bible Class at Wellington; Wesley Guild at Shifnal; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Kirby Moorside; British Workmen's Band of Hove at Shifnal; Wesleyan Society Class at Waters Upton; Wesley Guild at Sedburgh; Wesley Guild at Levenshulme, Manchester; Wesley Guild at Heaton, Mersey, Manchester; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Thornton Heath, Croydon; Meeting at Clayton-le-Moors; Wesley Guild at Whitchurch, Hampshire; Wesley Guild at Andover, Hampshire; Band of Hope at Smethwick; Wesleyan Methodist Society at Wellington; Temperance Worker's Committee at Conisborough, Yorkshire; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Westerhope, Newcastle; Brotherhood at Salford; Meeting at Berwick-on-Tweed; Wesley Guild at Bridgnorth; Leaders and Stewards at Llandudno; District Convention at Llandudno; District Convention at Oxford; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Wrexham; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Barnstaple; Wesley Guild at Stockport; Wesley Guild at Northallerton; Wesley Guild at Clayton-la-Moors; Society Class at Sheffield; Wesleyan Methodists at Carharrack, Cornwall; Meeting at Thornley, Durham; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Newcastle-on-Tyne; Meeting at Oldham; Wesley Guild at Coalbrookdale, Salop; Wesleyan Methodist Church at New Shildon; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Stirchey, Shropshire; Wesleyan Methodists at Stithians, Cornwall; Wesleyan Methodist School at Peckham; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Old Barford, Nottingham; Wesleyan Sunday School at Diseworth, Derby; Wesley Guild at Leigh, Lancashire; Wesleyan Sunday School at Shardlaw; Adult Bible Class at Sheffield; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Castle Donington, Derby; Temperance Committee at Manchester; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Brunswick, Earlestown; Wesley Guild at Berwick-upon-Tweed; Adult Temperance Society at Frimley Green, Farnborough; Band of Hope, Hope Murton; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Clydach; Band of Hope, Pontardawe; Swansea; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Gower, Porteynon, Reynoldstone, Neath, Glyn-Neath, Skewen, Jersey Marine, Aberdare, Port Talbot, Aberdulais, Abergevynfi; English Wesleyan Churches at Aberaman, Mountain Ash, Herwain, Treharris, Aberrynon, Trieynon; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Appleby Bridge, Wigan; Women's Meeting and Society Class, Bow Road; Men's Bible Class and Wesleyan Methodist Church, Lamberhead Green, Wigan; Church Class and Devotional Meeting and Wesley Guild, Bow Road; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Goose Green, Wigan, Wesleyan Methodist Circuit Committee, Rochdale; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Aspull, Wigan, Blackood, Chorley; Men's Society Class, Wellington; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Cronyelinfach, Ferndale, Bridgend, Cowbridge, Landore, Eaton Road, Swansea; Band of Hope, Mumbles, Swansea; Adult Band of Hope Skettey, Swansea; Men's Brotherhood, Croydon; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Hindley, Wigan, Rhiw, Pwllheli Wesley Guild, Mansfield Road, Nottingham; Men's Bible Class, Ince, Wigan; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Ingleby, Weston-on-Trent, Wigan; Wesley Guild, Plott Bridge, Wigan; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Nevin, Pwllheli; Wesley Guild. Conway Road, Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Lee Moor, Platt Bridge Wigan; Wesley Guild, Appleby, Westmorland; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at New Spring Wigan, Little Danler, Shildon, Warwick, Redworth Road, Warwick; Wesley Guild, Standishgate, Wigan; Sunday, School Teachers, Diggle, Oldham; Society Class, Hinksley; National British Women's Temperance Association, Crewkerne; Band of Hope, Hollins Lane, Garstang; Men's Society Class Wellington; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Penrith; Women's Meeting, Wesleyan Mission, Old Ford; Society Class, Lawley Bank; Women's Meeting Millwall; Band of Hope, Souldren, Banton; Wesley Guild, Sutton, Bonington; Sunday School, Sutton, Bonington; Wesley Guild, Castle, Donington; Wesleyan Methodist Church at Ratcliffe; Sons of Temperance Friendly Society, Weston-on-Trent; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Diseworth, Shardlow; Band of Hope, Diseworth; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Belton; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Upholland, Wigan; English Wesleyan Guild, Holyhead; Primitive Methodist Church, Houghton-le-Spring; Wesleyan Church and Working People's Concert, West Kensington, Park; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Merthyr Tydfil; Wesley Guilds as Herne Hill and Newark-on-Trent; Wesleyan Sunday School, Newton-le-Willows; Primitive Methodist Church Earlestown; Wesleyan Church, Leicester; Wesleyan Methodist Church Greenfields, Shrewsbury; Wesleyan Brotherhood, Victoria, Southport; Society Class Meeting, Watling Street, Wellington; Wesleyan Band of Hope, Troedyrhim; Wesleyan Methodist Council, South Staffordshire; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Burgess Hill, Brighton; Freemantle P.S.A., Howard Road, Southampton; Church Meeting Frodsham, near Warrington; Society Class, Victoria Chapel, Southport; Wesleyan Methodist, Pwllheli; Mission Tent, Brownhill, Walsall; Wolverhampton Band of Hope, Lewanwick, Launceston; Society Class, Lawley Bank; Society Class, Admaston; Society Class, Wellington; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Bracknell; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Fleets; Primitive Methodist Church, Bexhill; Brotherhood and Sisterhood, Chapeltown, Sheffield; Wesley Guild, Bramley, Brunswick; Wesley Bible Class, Standishgate, Wigan; Wesleyan Week Night Service; Men's Bible Class; Wesleyan Church Choir; Wesleyan Sunday School and Ladies Society Class Wealdstone; Wesley Guild, County Road, Liverpool; Wesley Guild, The Grove, Stratford, E.; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Pensilva, Dobwalls, and Upton Cross; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Driffield; Wesleyan Church, Park Road, Newcastle; Band of Hope, Keltey; Men's Bible Class, Wellington; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Albrighton; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Longparish; Temperance Meeting, Wellington; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Yealmpton; Trustees Meeting, New Cross; Wesleyan Mission, Newton-le-Willows; Congregation of Mission Hall, Brunswick Road, Earlestown; Tabernacle Wesleyan Church, Penrhyndendraeth, Monmouthshire; Wesley Guild, Misterton Nottingham; Brotherhood and Sisterhood, East Street, Southampton; Wesleyan Methodist Society, Broadoak, Lostwithhiel; Society Class, Wealdstone, Middlesex; Missionary Meeting, Sancton; Society Class, Old Park; Band of Hope, Coad's Green, Launceston;

Wesley Guild, Callington; of Primitive Methodist Churches and Temperance Societies: at Thorne, Gravesend, Oulton, Kirkbride, Silloth, Blennerhassel Mealsgate, Crookdake, Thursby, West Newton, Alston, Nentsbury, Nenthead, Garrigill, Stainmore, Newbiggin, Tebay, Kirkby, Orton, Greenholme, Knowbury, Angel Bank, Cleobury, Mortimer, Ludlow, East Harrild, Ashford Carbonel, Orleton, Hopton Bank, Wyson, Middleton, Tenbury, Yarpole, King's Heath, Bristol Hall, Stirchley, Lord Street, Erdington, Handsworth, Aston, Nechell, Kidderminster (2), Stourport, Alveley, Highley, Chetton, Bridgnorth, Bishop's Castle (2), Asterton, Moor Street, Pinsuilt, Lower Gonnall, Wollaston, Hill Street, Lye, Harts Hill, Mount Pleasant, Kinner, Silver Street, Bint Street, Wordsley, Bromsgrove, Bluntington, Madeley Heath, Belbroughton, Bromsgrove, Birmingham Road, Catshill, Wildmoor, Bowenheath, Leominster, Pembridge, Shirlheath, The Hundred, Ivington, Priestfield, High Street, Parkfield Road, Salop Street, Parkfield, Daisey Bank, Leintwardine, Bucknell, Walford, Birtley, Adley Moor, Adforton, Aymestry, Twitchen, Wolverhampton (2), Reddal Hill, Old Hill, New Inventon, Church Stretton, Leemore Common, Cardington, Peaton Strand (2), Bloxwich, Chadsmoor, New Invention, High Heath, Upper Landywood, Newtown, Bridgtown, Hednesford, Cheslyn Hay, Hazel Slade, Cradley, Hayes Lane, Blackheath, Halesowen, Langley, Cockshed, Harborne, Quarry Hill, Richmond Hill, York Road, Garforth, Stankes, Holbeach, Joseph Street, Woodhouse Hill, Stourton Hill, Armley (2). Wortley, Low Wortley, Farmley, Belle Vue, Jubilee Terrace, Cardigan Road, Kirkstall, Horsforth, Belle Vue, Crigglestone, Yewmillerdam, Durkar, Dewsbury, Batley Carr, Ravensthorpe, Talbret Street, Thornhill Lees, Horbury, Thornhill Edge, Middlestown, Overton, Netherton, Heacham, Bircham, Ringstead Docking, Thornham, Anmer, Stanhoe, Flitcham, Syderstone, Sedgeford, Tring, Rudham, Burnham Thorpe, Norwich (7), Beetley, Westfield, Toftwood, Hockering, Swanton Morley, Swannington, Reepham, North Elmhan, Lyng, Whinburgh, East Dereham, North Tuddenham, Lenwade, Bawdeswell, Shipsham, Sparham, Elsing, Mattishall, Garvestone, Sibton, Blythburgh, Westleton, Bramfield, Darsham, Barras Green, Coventry (2), Bromley Common, Crofton Wood, Penge, Basingstoke, Croydon (2), Thornton Heath, South Norwood, Sutton, Battersea, South Lambeth, Brixton, Kennington Park, Peckham, High Wycombe (3), Naphill, Lacey Green, Penn, Great Kingshill, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Wheeler End, Radnage, Downley, Abersychan, Pontypool, Swansea (3), Tredegar (2), Troedrhwogwair, Tirhowy, Great Doward and Penalt, Newton Common, Monmouth and Broadoak, Cwmcelyn, Nantyglo, Brynmawr, Blaina, Cwm-y-Gaish, Llangunllo, Lloiney, Knighton, Llandrinio, Neflach Wood, Deythews, Old Churchofold, Cwmbran, Pontnewydd, Pontnewynydd, Bradford (8), West Bowling, Idle, Calverley, Greengates, Halifax (4), Denholme, Cloughs, Huddersfield (6), Brierfield, Otley, Rawden, Guiseley, Yeaden, Burley in Wharfedale, Ilkley, Pateley Bridge, Darley, Clapham Green, Glasshouses, Clayton West, Emley, Skelmanthorpe, Denby Dale, Bretton West, Emley Moor, Thurlestone, Penistone, Countersett, Middleham, Shipley, Baildon, Windhill, Bingley, Ryecroft, East Morton, Wilsden, Harecrofts, Crossflatts, Colne, Trawden, Wycollar, Heckmondwike, Hightown, Littletown, Dewsbury Moor, Norristhorpe, Sowerby Bridge, Mytholmroyd, Norland, Warley, Barley, Barrowford (2), Wooldale Town End, Honley, Gate Head, Scholes, Broughton Rod, Bradley, Carleton, Cononley, Skipton, Settle, Nelson (3), Longstock, Stoke, Ashmansworth, St. Mary Bourne, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Vernham, Littledown, Leckford, Springbank, Turville Heath, Ibstone, Kingston, Stokenchurch, Beacons Bottom, Chinnor, Aylsham, Carpusty, Wood Dalling, Marsham, Wickmere, Aldborough, Sustead, Itteringham, Cawston, Hevingham, Pickering, Lockton, Thornton-le-Dale, Middleton, Newton, Stape, Wrelton, Brawby, Kirby Moorside, Marton, Rosedale, Helmsley, Gilling, Nawton, Pockley, Ampleforth, Hull. Scarborough (7), East Ayton, Seamer, Ruston (Wykeham), Cropton, Hutton-le-Hole, Newton Dale, Levisham Dogsthorpe, Newborough, Yaxley, Whittlesea, Werrington, Thorney, Peterborough (2), Woodton, Workington, Pica, Harrington, Workington, Weston Hills, Whaplode Fen, Manchester (2), Rusholme, Watton, Soham Toney, Thompson, Great Cressingham, Caston, Bodney, Ashill, Goatacre, Brinksworth, Wootton Bassett, Bushton, Grittenham, Cricklade, Braydon, Purton Stoke, Broadtown, Aston Reynes, Purton, Newbury, Wash Common, Leckhampstead Thicket, Snelsmore, Chieveley, Ashford Hill, Little Hungerford, Cold Ash, Hampstead Norris, Weston, Greenham, Houghton-le-Spring, New Lambton, New Pensham, Lumley Thicks, Blaydon-on-Tyne, Gritt, Norbury, Hyssington, Mainstone, Netherton, Sedgeley, Dudley (2), Brownhills, Norton East, Walsall Wood, Clayhanger, Burntwood, Lichfield, Sheffield, Chasetown, Watling Street, Brownhills West, Leigh's Wood, Wisbech St. Mary, Marshland Smeeth, March, Elm, Sutton Bridge, Wisbech, Emnitlo, Tholomas Drove, Harrold Bridge, Walsoken, Leverington, Tydd St. Giles, Gurhirn, Castleford (4), Glasshoughton, Kippax, Fryston, Woaozer, Tingley, East Ardsley, Morley, Normanton (2), Beckbridge, Allofts, Sharlston Common, Ossett (3), Thornhill Coombs, Stanningley, Pudsey (2), Rothwell, Methley, Carlton, Murrow, Tydd St. Gile's Fen, Tydd Gate, Walpole, Tilney St. Lawrence, Cross Keys, Walpole Marsh, West Bromwich (4), Wighton, Hindringham, Walsingham, Great Swaring, Deasenham, Tittleshall Litcham, Little Dunham, Lexham, Shropham, Croxton, Thetford, Cambridge, Childerley Gate, Oakington, Marshland Fen, Outwell, Stow Bridge, Hilgay, Downham, Upwell, Ten Mile Banks, Walpole Highway, Walton Highway, Over, St. Ives, Manea, Lake's End, Welney, Exmore, Suspension Bridge, Chatteris, Hundred Feet Bank, Sawston, Haslingfield, Cambridge (2), Stowmarket, Buxhall, Wyversbone, Old Newton, Swaffham, - Westacre, Castleacre, Sporle, Bradenham Hilhoughton, Wendling, Mileham, South Creake, Wreningham, Forncett St. Mary, Silfield, Pulham North Green, Hardingham, Kelsale, Orford, Theberton, Melton, Martham, Hemsby, Thurne, Catfield, Winterton, Repps, Hickling, West Somerton, Potter Heigham, Upper Dovercourt, Harwich, Wix, Great Oakley, Clacton-on-Sea, Kirby Cross, Weeley Heath, Thorpe-le-Soken, Walton-on-Naze, Tower Kirby, Bressingham, Winfarthing, Wilby, Wortham, New Buckenham, Old Buckenham, Diss, Banham, Sherringham, Holt, Kelling, Beckham, Langham, Gresham, Weybourne, Blakeney, Thornage, Letheringsett, Cley, Hemsworth, South Elmsall, South Kirkby, Thorpe Hesley, High Green, Grimesthorpe, Ecclesfield, Shiregreen, Sheffield (9), Templeborough, Woodland View, Dungworth, Chesterfield, Driffield, Kilham, Bainton, Fimber, Weaverthorpe, Wetwang, Langtoft, North Dalton, Lockington, Lund Etton, Frodingham, Hull (5), Beeston Tarporley, Alpraham, Halmerend, Wrinehill, Madeley, Knutton, Onnerley, Black Bank, Silverdale, Whitchurch, Broxton, Hampton Heath, Bickley, Tilston, Crewe by Farndon, Tallarn Green, Ogden, Burwardsley, Tattenhall, Malpas, Etruria, Longbridge Hayes, Dalehall, Sneyd Green, Burslem (3), Leek (3), Bradnop, Cellar Head, Rushton, Reapsmoor, Cheadle, Kingsley Holt, Hanley (2), Northwood, Bucknall, Abbey Hulton, Fenton, Welch Row, Burland, Chorley, Radnor Green, Sound Heath, Spurston, Bulkeley, Bunbury, Nantwich, Foxt, Waterhouses, Whiston, Froghall, Onecote, Kingsley, Talke Petts, Chesterton, Kidsgrove, Sunderland (7), New Silksworth, Malings Riggs, Southwick, Ryhope (2), Newcastle-on-Tyne, Hexham (9), Haydon Bridge, Acomb, Belsay, Ingoe, Langley-on-Tyne, Aydley, Talke, Eaglesea Brook, Miles Green, Uttoxeter, Abbots Bromley, Fole, Stanton, Oakamoor, Marchington, Stubwood, Wood Lane, Smallthorne, Spalding, Holbeach, Little London, Sutton, Gedney Drove End, Moulton Seas End, Holbeach Bank, Wheatley Hill, Haswell, Seaton Delaval, Burradon, Station Terrace, Cramlington, Dudley, West Cramlington, New Hartly, Bates Cottages, Dye House, Norham-on Tweed, Screwerston, Allerdean, Eyemouth, Berwick-on-Tweed, Durham, Pittington, Carville, Gilesgatemoor, Sacriston, Framwellgatemoor, Sherburn Colliery, Bearpark, Leamside, Nevill's Cross, Edmonsley, Shotley Bridge, Castleside, Blackhill, Consett, Bradley Cottages, Darlington, Lanchester, Allendale Cottages, Catton, Allendale Town, Sparty Lea, Allenheads, Keenley, Whiteley Shield, Corry Hill, Low Fell, Swalwell, Gateshead (2), Whitehall Road, Berwick Main, Kibbleswarth, Hetton-le-Hole, Easington Lane, Hetton Downs, Amber Hill, Bicker, Billingborough, Pinchbeck West, Gosherton Clough, Boston, Skeldyke, Anton's Gowt, Gipsy Bridge, Kirton End, Hubberts Bridge, Louth, Osmotherley, Brompton, Appleton Wiske, Stockton-on-Tees, Thornaby-on-Tees, Fairfield, Newtown, Whitby (2), Danby, St. John's Chapel, Brotherlee, Lanehead, Rookhope, Frosterley, Westgate, Stanhope, Crook, Tow Law, (Wolsingham), Bowden Close, Roddymoor, Billy Row, Howden-le-Wear, Sunnyside, Mount Pleasant, Stokesley, Hutton Rudley, Great Ayton, Scugdale, Faceby, Great Broughton, Greenhow, Battersby Junction, Guisborough, Skelton-in-Cleveland, Margrave Park, Boosbeck, Lingdale, Dunsdale, Stanghow, Middleton, Hartlepool (2), Loftus, Runswick, Hinderwell, Staithes, Skinningrove, Carlin How, West Hartlepool (4), Plaistow Green, Burghclere, Wallingford, Ewelme, North Moreton, Park Corner, Brightwell, Chilton, East Hagbourne, Long Wittenham, Benson, Didcot, Abingdon-on-Thames, Quainton, Whitchurch, Aston Abbotts, North Marston, Aylesbury, Witney, New Yatt, Chilson, Wootton, Brize Norton, Fordwells, Minster Lovell, Curbridge, Northleigh, Stonesfield and Charlbury, Sherston Magna, Upton, Tetbury, Clevurton, Luckington, Brotton, New Skelton, Cilfynyde, Pwllgwaun, Tonyriafail, Porth, Abergavenny, Llantheny Skirrid, New Tredegar, Bargoed, Pontlottyn, Argoed, Marchington Harbrough (2), Grimsby (2), East Harlsey, Matlock, Starkholme, Matlock Moor, Hackney, York (2), Shire Oaks, North Anston, Fir Dale, Dinnington, Munsterley, Snailbeach, Salop, Pennerley, Wrothen, Perkis Beach, Pontesbury, Aston, Meadow Town, Asterley, Rhosymedre, Rhosllanerchrngog, Pontyblew, Black Park, Vroncysyllte, Pontfaen, Bloxworth, Three Cross, Easton, Ropley, Baybridge, Alresford, Winchester, Withchurch, Barton Stacey, Sutton Scotney, Micheldever Station, Preston Candover, Upper Weild, Footon, Steventon, Cowes, Gurnard, Newport, Carisbrooke, Marks Corner, Southsea, Portsmouth, Portland, Bridgeford, Market Deeping, Stanground, Glinton, Northborough, Ruddington, Keyworth, Shelford, Nottingham (3), Greenhill (Croft), Smallbudge, Stubley, Shore, Folds Bolton, Handsacre, Salisbury (5), Southampton, Poole, Little Lonen, Corfe Mullen, Weston, Odicombe, Yeovil (2), Smallheath, Morgans Vale (Downton), Brenmore, Damerham, Whitsmey, Cranbourne, Mere, Zeals, Penselwood, East Knoyle, Hindon, Melbury, Enmore Green, Ludwell, Donhead, Alvediston, Cann Common, Tisbury, Paisley (2), Elderslie, Motherwell, Glasgow (7), Tranent, Cockenzie, Greenock, Banghurst, Charter Alley, Wolverton Common, Tadley, Silchester, Little London, Canterbury, Whitstable, Chartham Hatch, Pitham, Stelling Minnis, Boughton, Chilham Lees, Shalmesford, Shottenden, Faversham, Maidenhead, Great Marlow, Cookham Dean, Battersea, S.W., Wansworth, Fulham, Windsor, Bracknell, Winkfield, Chalvey, Slough, Sunningdale, Worcester Park, Forest Hill, S.E., Knights Hill (West Norwood), East Dulwich, West Norwood, Hamilton Road, Sheerness, Melton, Sittingbourne, Plumstead (2), Welling, Wickham Lane, Beenham, Quick's Green, Bradfield, Burns Hill, Theale, Redhill (2), Meadvale, Reigate, Yoxford, Wenhaston, Wrentham, Halesworth, Walpole, Rockland St. Peter, Hingham, Hadleigh, Trimley, Ipswich East Bergholt, Ipswich (2), Briston, Foxley, Binham, Edgefield, Bintry, Foulsham, Wood Norton, Fulmodestone, Colchester (2), Fingringhoe, Dedham, Brightlingsea, Leavenheath, Lexden, Fordham, Elmstead Heath, Langham, Crockleford, Great Bromley, Carlton Colvilie, Lowestoft (3), Toft Monks, Haddiscoe, Hales, Beccles, Bungay, Wymondham, Pulham Colgate End, Tibenham, Bunwell, Forncett St. Peter, Buncross, Sheffield (2), Chapeltown, Pont, Knockin Heath, Shrewsbury (2), Ditherington, Exford Green, Bayston Hill, Fords Heath, Longden, New Basford, Old Basford, Blue Bell Hill, Woodborough, Bulwell, Calverton, Oxton, Broughton, Baylestone, Egginton, Tutbury, Leicester (3), Anstey, Ilkestone, Heanor, Ilkestone, Langley, Derby (2), Melton Mowbray, Scalford, Asfordly, Long Clawson, Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Barlestone, Barwell Newbold Verdon, Stoke Golding, Stapleton, Wirksworth, Bole Hill, Cromford, Brassington, Ible, Matlock, Ashley Hay, Ripley (2), Golden Valley, Crick, Pye Hill, Codnor, Nether Heage, Westwood, Maishay, New Brinsley, Grantham (4), Stamford, Cottlesmore, Whissendine, Oakham, Kimberley, Eastwood, Awsworth, Eastwood, Langley Mill, Giltbrook, Kimberley, Long Eaton (2), Beeston, Stapleford, Breaston, New Sawley, Coalville, Whitwick, Heather, Emstown, Swannington, Hugglescote, Coalville, Ibstock, Porters' Buildings, Newstead, Tibshelf, East Kirkley, Annesley Woodhouse, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Bleak Hall, Edinburgh, Leith, Caledonian Road, N., Highbury, N., Camden Town, Tottenham, Wood Green, Edmonton, Custom House, Plaistow, North Woolwich, Beckton, Upton Park, Barking Road, Manor Park, Seven Kings, Ilford, Holloway, Woodberry, East Finchley, Dartmouth Park, Hounslow, Southall, Feltham, Brentford, Plaistow, East Ham, Forest Gate (2), Luton (7), Leagrave, Sharpenhoe, Barton-in-the-Clay, Harpenden, Redbourne, Bendish, Welyn, Paulersbury, Northampton (2), Abthorpe, Towcester, Northampton, Far Cotton, Bedford (2), Sterington, Oakley, Peterborough (2), Leighton Buzzard (2), Fenny Stratford, Blerchley, Linslade, Hitchin, Slotfold, Biggleswade, Shillington, Arlesley, Dunstable, Houghton Regis, Totternhoe, Toddington, Wellingborough, Rushden, Irchester, Raunds, Southend (2) Shoeburyness, Leigh-on-Sea, Great Wakering, Little Wakering, Southchurch, Westcliff, Longton (3), Twerton, Wellenhall, Tarporley, Whaplode Drove, Walham, Marshchapel, Holton-le-Clay, North Thoresby, Fulston, Alford, Cumberworth, Trusthorpe, St. Leonard's, Wainfleet, Irbey, Mablethorpe, Skegness, Wainfleet Bank, Mumby, Ingoldmells, Skegness Bank, Wintertown, Wintringham, Burton-on-Stather, Alkborough, Thealby, Appleby, Whitton. West Halton, Brigg, Hebaldstowe, Wrawby, Broughton, Scawby, Scawby Brook, Cadney, Howsham, Bishops Norton, Waddingham, Snetterby, Melton, Snetterby Carr, North Kelsey, South Kelsey, Barnetby, Chapel Hill, Donnington-on-Bain, Belchford, Horncastle, Mareham-le-Fen, Hagworthingham Spilsby, South Hetton, Murton, Low Moorsley, Shotton, Thornley, Ludworth, Wylam, Stocksfield, Walbottle, Lemington-on-Tyne, Elphingham, Seaton Hirst, Pegswood, Choppington, Linton, Hirst, Guide Post, Ashington, Coxhoe, Quarrington Hill, Cassop, Kelloe, West Cornforth, Castle Eden Colliery, Wingate, Durham (3), Sunderland, Swallow, Satterlen, Penrith, Lazonby, Skelton, Cockermouth, Blindcrake, Broughton, Keswich, Kendal, Staveley, Beckfoot, Kendal, Whinfell, Haltwhistle, Cowburn, Henshaw, Greenhood, Coonwood, Dufton, Crackenthorpe, Appleby, Wigton, Bothel, Aspatria, Walverden, Earley, Barnolnswick, Bridghouse, Greetland, Elland, Greetland Wall Nook, Rastrick, Batley, Gomersal, Birstall, West Ardsley, Kilpin hill, Manchester (12), Pendleton, Manchester, Ardwick, Swinton (2), Higher Openshaw, Droylsden, Bradford, Clayton, Eccles, Salford, Pendleton, Oldham, Bolton (4), Oldham, Bradwell, Tideswell, Chapel-en-le-Firth, Castleton, Little Hucklow, Dove Holes, Whitehough, New Mills, Little Hayfield, Hayfield, Brook Bottom, Thornsett, Haslingdean, Rawtenstall (2), Leigh, Glazenbury, Platt Bridge, Abram, Bickershaw, Glazebrook, Leigh, Bacup, Stacksteads, Change, Buxton, Monyash, Flagg, Ladmanlow, Upper End, Paddington, Chelmorton, Buxton, Bolton (2), Little Hulton, Walkden, Bolton, Mosley Common, Walkden, Hyde (2), Haughton Green, Ludworth, Marple, Ludworth, Mellor, Lowton, Edge Green, Golborne (2), Ashton-in-Wakerfield, Bamfurlong, Stockport, Hyde, Greave Fold, Romily, Horwich (2), Horwich Moor Old Kent Road, Walworth, Walthamstow (4), Chichester, Bognor, Fishbourne, Horsham, Roffey, Marden, Goudhurst, Galleywood, Great Waltham, Chelmsford, Wolverton, Stantonbury, Deanshaven, Potters Puny, Woburn Sands, Wavendon, Husbourne Crawley, Lidlington, Buckingham, Gawcott, Great Horwood, Cheltenham, Shipton Ollesse, Ryeworth, Tamworth, Warton, Alvecote, Glascote, Birchmoore, Folkestone, Chertsey, Shepperton, Ashford Common, Belfast (3), North Cave, South Cave, Elloughton, Newbold, Welton, Elleker, Gilberdeke, Newport, Hotham, Hull (3), Sheffield, Wells-next-Sea, North Creake, Coventry, Warwick, Buckington, Doncaster (2), Bentley, Armthorpe, Hatfield, Hatfield Woodhouse, Fishlake, Barnby Dun, Skyehouse, Stamforth, Winster, Youlgrove, Birchover, Elton, Northwood, Bakewell, Biggin, Retford, Clarborough, Lound, Ranskill, Rotherham, Eastwood, Parkgate, Wickersley, Greabro', Hoyland, Hoyland (7), Wombwell, Staveley, Clowne, Chesterfield (2), Eckington, Bareborough, Poolsbrook, Ifton Heath, Ruabon, Overton-on-Dee (2), Copperas, Welshpool, Barnsley, Claddia, Butlington, Trelystan, Wem, Bronington, Pool Head, Sands, Long Ditton, Norbiton, Kingston, Hampton hill, New Malden, Welshampton, Noneley Bettisfield, Quina Brook, Coton, Welsh Ena, Shieffield, Stocksbridge, Sheffield, Hemingbrough, Riccall, Selby, Rubwish, Cliffe, Osgodby, Bridlington Quay, Haisthorpe, Bridlington, Flambrough, Goole (3), Rawcliffe, near Goole, Howden Dyke, Howden, Barmley Marsh, Bugthorpe, Market Weighton, Melbourne, Seaton Ross, Bishop Wilton, Goodmanham, Hayton, Pocklington, Hull (5), Preston, Hull, York, Bethesda, Coniston, Garethorpe, Swinefleet, Whitgift, Little Driffield, Gembling, Kirkburn, Garsdon, Legbourne, Saltfleetby, Theddlethorpe, North Somercotes, Ludborough, Fotherley, Lincoln, Lincoln (2), West Firsby, In ham, Ryland, Owmley, Grimsby (4), Cleethorpes, Laceby, Irby, Beaconthorpe, Seghill, Annitsford, Cardiff, Startley, Hullavington, Inglestone Common, Eastbury, Lambourne, Aldbourn, Stratton St. Margaret, Blumsdon, Highworth, Lower Wanborough, Shaw, Swinton (9), Upper Stratton, Moredon, Strewkley, Drayton Parslow, Wing, Thornaby-on-Tees, Yarna on-Tees, Stockton-on-Tees (3), Northallerton, Phœnix Row, Bildershaw, Steinsdrop, Cockfield, West Auckland, Ramshaw, Tindale Crescent, Copley, Ingleton, Shildon, Heighington, Coundon Gate, South Church, Eldon Lane, Coundon, Close House, Middridge, Chilton Lane Ends, Leeholm, Spennymoor Ferryhill, Spennymoor (10), Bishop Auckland (7), New Tredegar, Mountain Ash (3), Penrhiwceiber, Abercynon, Kingstone, Madley, Dudley, Ploughfield, Shenmore, Lydbrook (5), Ruardean Hill, Abertillery, Cwmtillery, Blaeman, Abertillery (3), Cross Keys, Wattsville, Risca, Yynysdda, Crumlin, Leanbilleth, Wooleston, Lyaney, Ellwood, Clearwell, Llandaff, Cardiff, Gillingham, Reading (5), Wokingham, Witton-le-Wear, Whitwell, New Marske, Saltburn, Marske, Waterhomes, Redcar, Waterhouses, Middleton, Lunedale, Bowlees, Holwick, Harwood, Forest, Middlesbrough (7), Willington, Newfield, Byers Green, Sunnybrow, Oakenshaw, Binchester, North Skelton; of Park Road Wesleyan Church, Newcastle-on-Tyne Arthur's Hill Presbyterian Church, Newcastle-on-Tyne; inhabitants of Grimsby; twelve Tents of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Welsh Wesleyan Meeting of Treorky Circuit; Primitive Methodist Church at Dearham; Wesleyan Church, Scunthorpe; the International Order of Good Templars (1); Calvinistic Methodist Churches and Congregations in the County of Cardigan (21), in the Counties of Monmouth (8), Glamorgan (48), Carmarthen (15), Denbigh (39), London, Chester, Manchester, Liverpool (3), Dublin, Blackburn, Cricklewood, Calvinistic Churches in the County of Carnarvon (35), Mid Derbyshire Women's Liberal Association, Cheriton Fitzpaine United Band of Hope and Gospel Temperance Society, Devonshire public meeting at Goole, Presbyterian Church and Men's Society, Risca; Adults' School, Leeds; United Methodists, Sheffield; Primitive Methodist Churches (3); United Methodist Churches (2); and at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Petitions against: Of inhabitants of South Lancashire (5), Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, Worcester, Nottingham and District (16), Aldford, Boston, and district, Grantham and adjacent districts, Grimsby, Berkshire (2), Portsmouth, Bedford, Wiltshire, East Kent, Maidstone and District, Dover, Gloucester (3), Folkestone and District Licensed Victuallers' and Beersellers' Protection Association, Justices of the Peace of the County of Worcestershire, West Riding of the County of York, of persons signing (7), Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Statement as to Expenditure by local education authorities on the maintenance (as distinct from administration and loan charges) of public elementary schools, for the year ended 31st March, 1907.

UGANDA.

Correspondence relating to famine in the Busoga District of Uganda.

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879–1900.

Report of the Inspector for Scotland, under the Inebriates Acts, for the year 1907.

RIVERS POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT, 1876.

Report to the Secretary for Scotland by His Majesty's Inspector for Scotland under the Act (in continuation of [Cd. 8847.]).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVY (DISCIPLINE, PRISONS).

Rules and Regulations, dated 29th October, 1908, amending regulations for naval prisons, made by the Admiralty under the 81st section of the Naval Discipline Act.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 20th November, 1908, granting a retired allowance to Mr. William Stead, First Class Officer of Excise, Aberdeen Collection, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS ACTS, 1877 AND 1907.

Order, dated the 12th of November, 1908, entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Prohibition of Importation of Bushes) Amendment Order of 1908." Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. [No. 230.]

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

CATTLE IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture the following Questions, of which I have given private notice: (1) What number of vessels with cattle are on their way from ports in the United States the cargoes of which the Board of Agriculture have prohibited the landing; (2) Whether any action is being taken by the Federal or State authorities to cope with the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in America; (3) What is the extent of the trade between the prohibited ports and the United Kingdom; and (4) Whether the Board anticipates that the prohibition will cause a rise in the price of meat or add materially to the number of those unemployed in this country?

***THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON)**: My Lords, the reply to the first Question is that since information of the existence of the disease in the United States was received four vessels have arrived and six are expected. The cattle on the vessels which have arrived are, I am glad to be able to say, free from disease. The animals on all these vessels, whether diseased or not, will be slaughtered without delay—the usual ten days' interval will not be allowed. The answer to the second Question is that last Thursday the Board were informed that 100 Federal inspectors and some United States veterinary surgeons were applying measures which were adopted in 1902, including the slaughter of suspected herds, the destruction of carcases, and the disinfection of operators. The United States are doing everything in their power to meet this country, and have met us in every possible way. Stringent restrictions on the movement of cattle are in force, and the Federal authorities have assured our Ambassador that identical restrictions will forthwith be imposed wherever the disease spreads, and the information will be cabled to the Board at once. Just before I came down to the House I received the following telegram from the Ambassador of the United States—

> "Reported outbreaks in Maryland and Michigan are not confirmed. Both States are being carefully watched."

The answer to the third Question is that the total number of animals landed in this country from the United States were 168,380 odd cattle and 40,000 odd sheep. The number landed from the infected ports during the six months ended March 31st, 1908, was 63,849 cattle and 11,027 sheep. The reply to the fourth Question is that the live imports of cattle shipped from the United States represent less than 5 per cent. of our total meat supply, home and imported, and if they were entirely stopped, though, of course, it would mean a serious stoppage of local employment, yet the price of meat should not be seriously affected.

LICENSING BILL.

THE MARQUESS OF **LANSDOWNE**: My Lords, I beg to give notice that on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Licensing Bill I shall move an Amendment in the following terms: "That this House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be effected by the Bill."

NAVY—SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.

EARL **CAWDOR** rose to call attention to the shipbuilding programme of the Government, and to the possible position of the country in 1911–1912, and to ask what steps His Majesty's Government proposes to take in order to secure an absolute two-Power standard, with a margin for contingencies, against any possible combination of foreign Powers.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I do not think I shall be exaggerating when I say that there has been for some months past a considerable feeling of uneasiness throughout the country with respect to the condition of the Navy. It is a condition of anxiety not based so much upon the present position of the Navy, but almost entirely upon the view of the immediate future—upon the feeling which thoughtful men who study this question have that, however our naval supremacy may be assured at the present time, as I believe firmly that it is assured, there is no time to lose in the preparations that we must make if within a very short limit of time that supremacy is to be maintained. It is to this need for immediate preparation that I wish to ask the attention of His Majesty's Government and of the House.

For some years past there has been a great doubt as to the views of His Majesty's present advisers with respect to the two-Power standard. There have been halting, equivocal, contradictory, statements with respect to that standard, but within the last few days a statement has been made by the Prime Minister which has been received with a sigh of relief throughout the length and breadth of the British Dominions—a statement clear, distinct, and unqualified. The Prime Minister, in that statement, lays down the two-Power standard to be—

> "A preponderance of 10 per cent. over the combined strengths in capital ships of the two next strongest Powers."

That is a standard which we on this side of the House have laid down for many years past. It is a standard which I had often hoped had been accepted by His Majesty's Government; but the contradictory statements we have had from time to time have shaken our faith in that matter. To-day I hope and believe that it is a standard which may be accepted absolutely by both sides—a standard not of party, but of naval efficiency at which the country means to aim. We shall hope to co-operate fully with His Majesty's Government in the maintenance of that standard, and I rejoice to feel that after this statement of the Prime Minister we need look no further, but may accept it absolutely and distinctly both in the spirit and in the letter—which is, I am quite certain, the way in which His Majesty's Government intend it should be carried out.

It is of the utmost importance that the standard should be a general standard. There is to my mind the greatest possible objection to eliminating any Powers from that standard and to focussing in any way the standard we are building up for our naval supremacy as against one or two individual Powers. Assume, for the moment, that it was proposed to eliminate Power A on the ground that we had a treaty with that Power. Power B is an Anglo-Saxon Power; it is incredible that we should go to war with an Anglo-Saxon Power. Therefore, we also eliminate Power B. We come to

Power C, and we find that we have an *entente cordiale* with that Power. That Power would have to be eliminated, and then we should have arrived at this stage, that it would be perfectly clear to Power D that she was the only Power against whom we could possibly be aiming. That, I think, has been well and wisely dealt with in the statement made by the Prime Minister. He takes the general basis, and the general basis, I submit, is the only safe basis on which the country can go. The alternative was put before the country in 1906, when the late Prime Minister used these words—

> "When you talk of a two-Power standard, after all you cannot quite keep out of your mind who the two Powers are. When we have elaborate calculations made as to what France and Germany are building, is it really a very likely contingency that France and Germany should be allied and should go to war with us? I do not object to the two-Power standard as a rough guide, but this is a two-Power standard almost of a preposterous kind."

My Lords, I trust we have done with qualifications such as that. We take our stand side by side with the Prime Minister and the Government, and we claim that we have now a standard of efficiency against any two Powers—whoever they may be—who represent at the time the strongest Powers in the world.

I think it cannot be too often said that our policy of naval supremacy is merely a policy of defence. We have no desire for aggression, but we intend to maintain the safety of our own shores. We intend to defend, and to provide for, the safety of the food supply of our people, and for our commerce all over the world. That is a position which no foreign country has the slightest right to deny us or to object to, and, speaking a short time ago, the Prime Minister made a statement which, I think, bears out that view. He said—

> "There is not one of the Great Powers of all the world at this moment, I believe, without a single exception, which views with animosity, jealousy, or misgiving the Navy of Great Britain being maintained at what we call the two-Power standard."

That surely emphasises and makes perfectly clear the point that the standard of our supremacy must always be absolutely a general standard. There is only one way in which we can maintain the absence of any feeling of jealousy by foreign countries, and that is by maintaining this standard in the words which were so well laid down by the Prime Minister.

Let us consider what is to be the burden of the maintenance of this standard. If we are to maintain our two-Power standard we shall have to complete, over and above the programme we have already taken up, by the end of 1911, six or seven first-class ships, and when we come to 1912 we shall have to provide very much the same number again. My excuse for pressing the subject upon His Majesty's Government is the shortness of time there is for making preparations in order to carry this out. The usual practice, after the introduction of the Budget and the decision taken in respect of the number of ships to be laid down, is that the ships are not laid down till a good many months later—often not until the end of the year, and sometimes not until the beginning of the next year. It takes something like two and a half years to build a first-class ship—sometimes less, but sometimes more—and I would ask His Majesty's Government not to pin themselves too closely in this matter. We have had many samples of the delay in shipbuilding due to strikes, labour troubles, and many other things, and after the Budget of next year there will not be a month to lose if you are to be absolutely sure of completing your six or seven ships within two and a half years, and if you are to maintain your standard of supremacy.

I ask the Government to give some information in regard to their intentions in that respect—I think it is a matter on which the country feels very strongly and deeply—and I trust they may be able to allay any feelings of anxiety that may exist by a statement of what they propose. The Government are aware of the information at their disposal and of the time in which they can produce and complete the ships, as well as the dates on which foreign ships are likely to be completed. I am not pressing them as to dates; but I ask them, in casting their minds to the end of 1911, when the pressure of competition of the two-Power standard will become keen, to give an assurance that whatever may be needed in the way of laying down ships will be done in order that the standard of supremacy may be secured. If that is not done, then in two and a half years our two-Power standard may disappear.

Another point in battleship construction has reference to the guns and the gun-mountings. In the past allegations have been made that ships could not be ready owing to the want of guns, and I should say that the question of the gun-mountings is even more difficult and more pressing. You have to be further ahead with gun-mountings than with ships; and, moreover, only certain firms provide gun-mountings. Changes are sometimes made that are absolutely necessary for the efficiency of the lates ship which upset the arrangements made in the previous gun-mountings and delay the possibility of providing them within a reasonable time. I ask the Government, therefore, whether that question has been looked into, and whether arrangements have been made, or will be made at once, in order that there may be no delay in the completion of the six or seven vessels, or whatever number may be absolutely necessary, by the end of 1911 with respect to guns and gun-mountings.

I pass to the question of finance. The financial burdens in respect of naval construction during the next few years will be very heavy indeed. I have no wish in any way to make an attack on the Government. Indeed, I am anxious to co-operate with them in every way I possibly can. I think that the new definition of the two-Power standard, acknowledged by the Government, puts upon us a burden to show as clearly as we can that we wish to work hand in hand with them. But we are obliged to look at what the cost of this heavy financial pressure will be during the next few years. A battleship costs not less than £2,000,000. Three years ago we calculated its cost at £1,800,000, but the size and the cost of ships have increased since that date. Six or seven ships between now and 1911, and six or seven more between 1911 and 1912, will cost a great deal of money.

Before we went out of office in 1905. as far as we could see, the ordinary requirements of shipbuilding in battleships would be about four a year. Thus four ships were laid down in 1905–6, but in 1906–7 three ships were laid down instead of four. I am not going to cavil at that. Without information as to expert advice, but speaking from what I could hear, I should say that the reduction of a ship in that year was probably amply justified by what was going on abroad. There had been a slackening-off in the battleship programme of foreign countries due to a new type of vessel. In 1907–8 there will be three ships instead of four; in 1908–9 only two ships would be laid down instead of four, which we thought were the ordinary requirements. It was then pointed out with great satisfaction that there would be a gain of £1,700,000 in two years of non-construction. But the construction Vote in that year is the lowest it has ever been for ten years. I had grave doubts as to whether it was the wisest policy to have the construction Vote cut down lower than it has been for more than ten years and to rejoice in the reduction of the Vote by £1,700,000 in two years, when everyone knew, and the Government better than anyone else, the enormous pressure that would be placed on this country in 1911 and 1912 in order to regain at a heavy cost and under much difficulty a supremacy which might have been retained had they looked a little further ahead. There was much talk at one time about naval savings. These savings were absolutely unreal, because they were nothing less than deferred liabilities. These things have to be faced, and one cannot help feeling that if three or four ships in the last three years had been laid down, the pressure to-day of securing and maintaining the two-Power standard in 1911 and 1912 would have been very different as far as the financial pressure is concerned from what we find it to be to-day.

It has been said by the noble Lord the late Civil Lord (Lord Lochee of Gowrie) that battleship construction was the dominating item of naval expenditure. That is undoubtedly true; but there is a great deal more behind. A battleship is a thing that looms very big in the public mind. The "man in the street" can understand a battleship; but he knows nothing of the accessories and necessities of the Fleet outside a battleship. A battleship without accessories is absolutely useless for any purpose. Battleships carry with them of necessity scouts, destroyers, submarines, men, and stores, and last, but by no means least, docks for the battleships. I believe that the Government are well aware of the need of scouts as eyes for the Fleet, and I believe that they are taking steps now to strengthen the Fleet in that respect.

One word with respect to destroyers. In the early part of the year I expressed a strong opinion that we were counting too much on destroyers which were absolutely out of date, and in comparing them with the modern destroyers of foreign countries as if they were equally efficient. I feel this to be the case still, though I hope the feeling will be diminished by what has since been done. The late First Lord of the Admiralty gave us some information on this point in March last. The noble Lord said—

> "We expect to have ready at the end of this month, of ocean-going destroyers of 33 knots, 4; of the river class, 34; of 30-knot destroyers, 48; of 27-knot destroyers, 28; of coastal destroyers, 15—making a total of 129."

The noble Lord also said—

> "So far as the two-Power standard is concerned, I think I have made a good case for the destroyers. We are going to lay down sixteen new destroyers. They will be of the last improved river class, still improved. They will do thirty-three knots."

But a curious statement has since been made in another place in respect of these destroyers. I ask the Government to give us some information with regard to them. The statement made is that these 33-knot destroyers had never been decided upon and that there was some mistake in the statement. But the statement was a definite one made in a speech which I note was corrected by the late First Lord. It has been allowed to remain on record as the intention of the Admiralty until a few days ago. I should be the last in the world to press anyone if a mistake were made even in a matter so important as that, but I say that it is treating the country with scant consideration if a mistake was made in March last in the knowledge of the Admiralty and that no correction of the statement is made until two or three days ago. It is very unfortunate that the correction should be so long delayed. Naturally it leads some people in the direction of thinking that this is one means of cutting down and scraping off some expenditure. I hope that is not the case, and, in any case, I think it is due to the country and your Lordships that we should be told, as far as possible, the reasons of the change, and what these sixteen destroyers are to be, what is their tonnage, and what their capacity in the way of carrying coal.

Earl Cawdor.

Then I turn to stores. We have had a good many statements in regard to stores. In spite of the allegation that everything is well, I cannot shut my eyes to the perpetual rumours I hear from all quarters to the contrary. I hear perpetual complaints that the stores are not sufficient and not in a satisfactory condition; that vessels come in requiring stores and find none in dock. I hope that is not the case. I hope the Government will be able to give us some reassuring information on that subject, for no one is more anxious than I am that these rumours should be set at rest.

I turn from the accessories of battleships to the all-important question, to my mind, of docks. The question of docks is not alone a question of repairs. You require a safe base in the North Sea not alone for repair purposes, but to which you may retire your battleships instead of leaving them out to be attacked, possibly, by forty or fifty destroyers during a winter night. I believe that in naval circles this is felt to be one of the great needs of the present day. Consider the position. In 1911 we hope to have eighteen or nineteen "Dreadoughts" or better than "Dreadnoughts," and these better than "Dreadnoughts" will be longer and will require more space and more accommodation. By 1912 we shall have twenty-five vessels of that class. Where is to be their base, and how do we compare with the great country that confronts us on the other side of the North Sea? The navy of that country is very well based for protective purposes as well as for repairs. I appreciate the difficulty; but the difficulty is one which must be faced if our battleship Fleet is to be efficient as a fighting fleet, and to be in a secure position in the North Sea in the next few years. We are told that Rosyth is to be partly finished in seven years and rather more finished in ten. That surely indicates a rather serious position—that we are to raise our battleship Fleet to something like twenty or twenty-five vessels in the next three or four years and have no prospect of getting our first new naval base ready for seven or possibly ten years. I would ask the Government to consider the matter with all the earnestness they can, for, in my belief, it is one of the gravest questions we have to face.

May I make an appeal to the Government not to pass us off on the plea that it is unconstitutional to tell us anything before the Navy Estimates are presented? This is an exceptional time. We see a battleship programme prepared by foreign countries of quite an exceptional character. We must take exceptional steps to meet it. I am most anxious that the Government should as far as they can take the country into their confidence in this matter, let them feel, as I feel and believe, that what they propose to do with respect to the two-Power standard is to carry it out in the spirit as well as in the letter. There are many people who are still doubting, and who, when you talk to them and say everything is well, reply: Why, then, do not they lay down some more ships? Two or three more ships laid down speedily will mean a great deal more than many words.

A statement by the Government would be of the utmost value in settling and steadying foreign opinion abroad. It is of the utmost value to foreign countries to know that we are absolutely determined in this country on both sides of politics standing side by side, as I hope we always shall, to maintain the strength and supremacy of the Navy, that we have not the slightest intention of being caught, as we may be caught, unless great supervision and great care are exercised. In my belief, there is no greater safeguard for the peace of the world than the strength and supremacy of the British Navy. I ask the Government, therefore, to give us all the information they can, and I beg to assure them that I raise this question in no carping spirit, but with the firm and honest desire to co-operate with them in order to maintain always and under all conditions the naval supremacy of this country.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, I will endeavour to the best of my ability to answer the questions put by the noble Earl opposite. I can assure the noble Earl and the House that the two-Power standard will be maintained as it has always been maintained, whatever party has been in power in this country But to state now what His Majesty's Government propose to lay down in next year's Estimates is a procedure which has never been followed by any Government in this country. The noble Earl expressed the wish that the Navy should be kept out of party politics. On that we are all of one mind. We look upon the Navy as our great asset; the whole safety of the country depends upon it, and it would ill become any Government to endanger its supremacy. The noble Earl went on to say that the Navy was to be used for purely defensive purposes. That, again, is a statement in which we cordially concur.

As regards the position of this country in relation to other countries, at the end of 1911 we shall have eight "Dreadnoughts" and four "Invincibles." The "Invincibles" are included in the "Dreanought" class. The Germans will have thirteen. That is excluding the programme which we intend to lay down this year. The noble Earl complained that the Government had not laid down a larger number of battleships in 1906–7 and 1907–8. At that time there was really only a paper programme to meet. Germany had stated that she proposed to lay down certain ships. The life of a battleship is only some twenty years, and every month or two months there is some change in machinery or in fighting strength of which it is important to take advantage. The object, therefore, is to lay down ships as late as possible and to add to them any improvement that might have been thought of in the meantime. The intention of the Admiralty is in no way to stint the programme. If we find an acceleration of shipbuilding going on elsewhere, naturally we shall do the same for this country.

The noble Earl referred to gun-mountings not being always ready when every other part of the ship was complete, and to the fact that it had to be borne in mind that there were few companies in this country which manufactured armaments and mountings. I think my noble friend must trust us there. We claim that by the end of 1911 all the ships mentioned will be in commission. I therefore think your Lordships may trust the Admiralty to see that all fittings are ready for the ships when the time comes. The noble Earl then went into the question of stores and expressed his fear that they were not being kept up to the normal standard. That is in no way the case. All stores are now in sufficient quantity and in good condition. A great improvement has been effected in the store-houses and in the sale of redundant and obsolete stores, and there is now a standardisation of all necessary reserves. The noble Earl then went into the question of whether the torpedo-boat destroyers were adequate and compared favourably with those of other nations. At the present time we have 143 of these vessels built; there are ten building and also sixteen——

EARL CAWDOR: Can the noble Earl give us the age of the 143 vessels?

THE EARL OF GRANARD: I cannot give the age of all of them, but I understood that about 12 per cent. are not quite up to the modern standard. Ten are building, and there are in addition the sixteen new vessels of the new river class. The noble Earl has told the House that the contract speed of these boats was 33 knots. It is very unfortunate that a mistake in this occurred. There was never any intention on the part of the Admiralty to make these 33 knot boats. The contract was for 27 knots and that is what they were going to be made. Their tonnage will be 900. The boats of the old river class were designed for 25 knots. The advisers of the Admiralty are of opinion now that the river class, which have been in commission for some time, compare favourably in every way with ships of, perhaps, a higher speed. In all this class of design we have to consider sea-keeping qualities, durability of machinery, strength of construction, and radius of action, all of which means more weight to be carried. Although we are told that foreign Powers have destroyers of 30 knots we know nothing of the conditions of the trials that have been carried out. As to the question of docks and the position of a fleet of "Dreadnoughts" on the East Coast, it is perfectly true there is no dock at present on that coast which would take a "Dreadnought," but there are places on the East Coast where they would be protected. Behind the boom at Sheerness, for instance, a lot of "Dreadnoughts" could be got in and Rosyth will be shortly a defended fortress.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Shortly? When?

THE EARL OF GRANARD: We hope that the contracts for Rosyth will be placed in January, and that the work will be completed in seven years. A bonus is being given to the contractor in the hope of expediting the work. Of course on the South Coast there is ample dock accommodation. I only need add that the Government regard it as absolutely essential that the policy of the two-Power standard should be carried out; that is to say, that we should have a Fleet which would be capable of dealing successfully with two foreign Powers, and that there should be a margin of 10 per cent. above that. I do not think I can end better than by repeating the words of Sir Edward Grey, that there is no half-way house between safety and danger.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I am not satisfied with the Answer which has just been given by the noble Earl opposite. The noble Earl made no mention of cruisers; and if he had inquired of naval officers on the active list he would have found that a great many of them are of opinion that battleships are not safe at sea unless accompanied by cruisers. The battleship may be the king of the sea by day, but by night the torpedo is a dangerous and formidable pretender to its supremacy. The double standard should mean the double standard all the way down. Nothing short of that is sufficient. Nelson once said—

> "The want of frigates will be found written on my heart."

I hope no admiral or commander now on the active list will ever have occasion to utter a similar sentiment. Such things as supplementary Estimates have been repeatedly voted in comparatively recent times, as in 1885. I never heard of any firm of shipowners who tied the hands of their managers by insisting that no meeting of directors should ever come to a decision as to what ships they should order to be built except during one particular month of the year. Nor do any large business firms act on this principle when they have to consider questions of exceptional expenditure. Such a system would in many cases be suicidal, as it would give their rivals several months start, which is exactly what the Admiralty are now doing.

Money is of value in war, and when making preparations for war, but time is often of greater value, and cannot be purchased when too late by any amount of gold. And yet with our recent experience of the fragility and piecrust qualities of treaties, while all Europe is simmering with anxiety, the Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Admiralty deliberately throw away five months time. This is playing hare to the foreign tortoise with a vengeance. They deliberately go to sleep for five months, and then they say that they will wake up and tell us what they mean to do next Easter. They ought to tell us before Christmas. In the present fevered state of Europe nothing would have a more tranquilising effect, nothing would be more likely to maintain peace than a notice that the weakest state in Europe in proportion to its population had determined to take proper measures for its protection without delay. A supplementary Estimate for the purpose of building destroyers, more improved "Dreadnoughts," and docks on the east coast is what is required immediately. The destroyers, if commenced at once, should be ready for sea in a much shorter time than the battleships.

I have seen in a newspaper that the Admiralty are delaying to give out contracts for shipbuilding because some firms are believed to have formed a ring to keep prices up. I have no means of ascertaining the truth of this; but, if it is suspected that this may be the case, why are the slips in Government dockyards from which the "St. Vincent" and "Collingwood" were launched at Portsmouth and Plymouth, silent and empty? When on former occasions other ships were launched, fresh keels were immediately laid down, sometimes on the very same day. I believe in continuity of administration at the Admiralty, and I consider that the present Cabinet made one of the gravest financial mistakes ever made by a Government when it deviated from the Cawdor Programme. I was in Germany during the autumn of 1906, and found all Germans cock-a-whoop at the signs of weakness that England was showing which encouraged them to the further efforts they are now making. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us that he is looking out for more henroosts to rob. The henroosts that he has already robbed are the shipbuilding yards, both public and private. Those fine old hens, Portsmouth and Plymouth Dockyards, have hatched out and reared some very fine chickens on the building slips that gave birth to the "Collingwood" and "St. Vincent." Many of our other hens, however, have been unable to hatch out chickens, because the Government have robbed their nests of the golden eggs which alone can produce them. There is, I am told, no large ship at present on the stocks at Chatham.

The country that must always hold the command of the sea as a necessity of its existence should always allow for having ships under repair on the decisive day, whereas the nation that challenges her, knowing the day beforehand, can always arrange to put her whole strength into the balance at one particular time, but she cannot count on having all her strength always ready at any time, any more than the possessor of the seas that she is attacking. Take, for instance, the war with Japan. The Japanese did not know for certain when the Russians would sally from Port Arthur, and were, therefore, unable to make use of all their ships on 10th August. But when the Baltic Fleet came out they had ample notice of its movements, and were, therefore, able to put everything they had that could float and fight into line at the Battle of Tsusima. In Captain Montagu Burrows' "Life of Lord Hawke," I find the following remark on his victory off Finisterre—

> "There are no less than twenty-five line of battleships in this Western squadron, and nineteen of them were handed over to Hawke, yet he had only fourteen with him in his battle of October the 14th."

So that the question of repairs was as much a problem in those days as it is now. Like the poor, we shall always have it with us.

I have in my hand a Return, dated 31st July, of the number of days in the year that our more recent battleships and large cruisers were under repair. On examining Part II. of the Return I find that in 1905–6, twenty-six battleships were 2,197 days under repair. Adding one-sixth, that is 366 days, for Sundays, and dividing by twenty-six, gives an average of about ninety-eight days in dockyard hands for each ship. In 1906–7 a similar calculation gives an average of 114 days under repair for twenty-eight battleships, an increase of sixteen days, probably due to the necessity of fitting cooling apparatus to magazines. Applying the same calculation to cruisers, I find that in 1905–6 thirty-one cruisers averaged 105 days under repair, and that in 1906–7 thirty-three cruisers averaged 135 days under repair, an increase of thirty days. With these figures before me I think I am justified in assuming that our battleships and cruisers are unavailable for service during at least three months in the year.

I shall not say much about the necessity of keeping up a powerful Navy, because both Mr. Asquith and Mr. McKenna have used language fully as strong as any that I could use about the necessity of a sufficient Navy. If words could build ships, their utterances would be quite satisfactory. But what have they done? One expects deeds, not words only, from a Government. Words are the ammunition of an Opposition. Words alone will not build ships. It takes money to do that. Where are their supplementary Estimates? Are the Government going to allow six months more to pass without beginning to build their arrears in battle ships and destroyers? Or are they going to make fresh requests to other Powers to cease shipbuilding? The policy of asking another country to stop her rivalry with Great Britain is a suggestion that one might expect to be made by a good little girl of about seven years old at a Sunday school. It is not a policy for grown-up men who pose as statesmen. This request encouraged the German Navy League to fresh exertions, as they saw England faltering at the first signs of being collared in the race.

Lord Ellenborough.

When Lord Goschen was First Lord of the Admiralty he once said his most important duty was that of a transmuter of metals—to turn gold into different forms and shapes of iron and steel. It is not the duty of a First Lord to restrict himself to the use of words. The Government have acted unwisely in reducing their War Estimates. I think they know it now, but they will not produce supplementary Estimates as they wish to save their faces. But why not save their faces by pleading that the perturbed condition of Europe and the unexpected violation of treaties are sufficient reasons for reconsidering the conclusions that they came to some months ago? I interpret the two-Power standard not only to mean a fleet equal to that of any two Powers plus 10 per cent., but also a fleet double that of any European Power. Mr. McKenna calls this an expansion of the two-Power theory. It is a very necessary one. The history of naval alliances shows the immense advantage possessed by a fleet under one command over two fleets under separate command. I think it will be even greater than formerly. At present men-of-war when in line are perpetually signalling to one another. Misunderstood signals will mean collisions and torpedo attacks on allies. Therefore, a fleet of twenty battleships and auxiliaries under one flag will be far more formidable than two fleets of the battleships, and two sets of auxiliaries, under two flags; in consequence of this we require double the fleet of any one European Power. As we want seven "Dreadnoughts," cruisers to protect them, and many destroyers laid down, it would be better for us to make up our minds and to announce our intention of doing so at once, to employ labour as soon as possible, and thereby kill two birds with one stone by lessening the number of the unemployed.

LORD LOCHEE OF GOWRIE: My Lords, I am sure I may with confidence appeal to your Lordships for that indulgence which you always extend to a Member who addresses the House for the first time. I do not know that I should have claimed that privilege on this occasion but for the fact that the notice of the noble Earl as it appeared in the Paper appeared to foreshadow an attack on the shipbuilding programme and the Estimates of the present year for which I was in a large degree responsible. I have no complaint whatever to make of the noble Earl's criticisms, but I would remind him that as regards the programme of the present year and the Estimates embodying it, it is a little belated, these being passed into law and there being nothing left now but for the Government to carry them into execution.

After having been for sixteen years responsible for the conduct of naval debates either in office or in opposition in the other House, I may say that I do not remember any Estimates in any year that have been the subject of so much criticism as the Estimates of the present year and the shipbuilding programme which formed part of them. I have been authorised to say on behalf of our naval advisers that the shipbuilding programme which the noble Earl attacked was sufficient in their opinion to maintain the two-Power standard for the time being. I have some figures which I will read to your Lordships by-and-by in support of that statement, but in the meantime I will content myself by saying that of the criticisms to which our Estimates were exposed one section asserted that our figures were too high, and the other that they were too low. Those who said that our Estimates were too high, who said so in the spring of this year, I think would hardly venture after all that has happened to repeat the expression of that opinion now.

The second part of the noble Earl's notice appeared to me to be open to objection on a totally different ground. In effect, what the noble Earl asks is a disclosure by the Government of the Estimates for the coming year. I do not take the point that the noble Earl anticipated that it would be unconstitutional to do so. It would be quite inconsistent on my part to say anything of the kind, because on two occasions I have recently disclosed a considerable portion of the Estimates for the coming year, but I do take this point that it must be left to the Government of the day in the exercise of its discretion and responsibility to say whether such a disclosure can be made. I think on this point that the notice of the noble Earl is premature. He has himself been First Lord of the Admiralty, and he knows very well that in this month of November the officials of the Admiralty are grappling with the very problem which he is presenting to us to-night. This is a time above all other times when I think Parliamentary pressure, and even Parliamentary suggestion, should be withheld. After considerable experience of naval Estimates and naval matters, I think it tends to weaken responsibility in a Department to have pressure put upon it during this period of incubation, and premature disclosure may mean, and sometimes must mean, hasty decisions, and hasty decisions are to be deprecated more perhaps in the Navy than in any other Government Department.

Then it is always to be remembered that there is a certain advantage in a Fabian policy, if I may so describe it, as regards shipbuilding. There is a certain advantage gained by what has been the custom of the Admiralty and the Government of this country in delaying, I was going to say, almost to the last moment, any announcement as to what their shipbuilding programme is going to be. It has been their practice to let other countries commence their programmes and to wait until they know what other nations are going to do, and then try to go one better. The noble Earl was responsible for a breach of this policy in the building of the "Dreadnoughts." I am not going to enter into any controversy or to make any controversy on that point to-night, but the noble Earl knows as well as I do, that there are high authorities for saying that the "Dreadnought" policy was premature, and the premature policy so described is responsible for a good many of the difficulties of the situation in which we now find ourselves.

Passing from these general observations, I come to the gravamen of the noble Earl's attack upon the Admiralty, if I may so describe it.

EARL CAWDOR: I do not think that I made any attack upon the Government.

LORD LOCHEE OF GOWRIE: Perhaps that was a slip of the tongue. I might use the word "critique." That phrase will perhaps better describe his case, but I was going to venture in these days of definition, to put his question in a form which was not the form in which he laid it before your Lordships. I conceive that the question he addressed to the Admiralty was this: "What do you propose to do? What steps do you propose to take, and when, in order to maintain in the year 1911–12 the absolute two-Power standard as recently defined?" I think that is a correct statement of the question which he addressed to this bench. I suggest that that implies as a preliminary, what I do not think it received from the noble Earl, and what I do not think he would venture really to give and what I certainly should decline to give, namely, an estimate of the international and naval situation as it will be in the period to which he refers. What is to be the situation of the various Navies of the world in the year 1911–12, which we are to take steps to guard against now? The noble Earl attempted no such description or definition, and if he had I should certainly have declined to follow him, because at a moment's notice, or even after a great deal of notice, one could not possibly arrive at any decided conclusion in the matter. But I am going to do the next best thing, and what I propose to do is relevant to the first part of the noble Earl's criticism as well as to the question with which he concluded. I am going to make an attempt to estimate the international position as it is to-day with reference to the two-Power standard. That is an easier query, but it is by no means an easy one, and I do not attempt to give anything like certainty in the matter, but I will tell your Lordships what I propose to do. In the new definitions of the two-Power standard occurs the phrase "capital ships." The time is approaching, I imagine, when we shall be asked to define that phrase. I am not going to define it, but for the purpose of my present statement I am going to assume that by "capital ships" I may be taken to mean, first, battleships and, secondly, armoured cruisers.

Lord Lochee of Gowrie.

EARL CAWDOR: All armoured cruisers?

LORD LOCHEE OF GOWRIE: Yes. I am not giving it as a definition of a capital ship. I do not know how that would turn out. The capital ship that I take for the purpose of making a comparison with regard to other Navies is this: I will take all the battleships and all the cruisers in the four principal Navies of the world which are less than twenty years of age, counting their age from the date of launching. I think the noble Earl will admit that that is perfectly fair as regards them all.

EARL CAWDOR: Does the noble Lord take, as regards the two-Power standard, all armoured cruisers?

LORD LOCHEE OF GOWRIE: I am trying to take the relative position with reference to the two-Power standard. By making the statement that I am now going to make it will be quite clear what I mean. I take the four great naval Powers—Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States, and I take, first of all, the whole of their battleships under twenty years of age, dating from the time of launching. I am also going to take in another table, too, the armoured cruisers of those Navies, and I will take their number and give their tonnage. I daresay the noble Earl will object that neither tonnage nor armour in itself is conclusive, and I do not say it is, but they are the two most important and most vital elements in a comparative statement. They stand for something; indeed, they stand for everything unless there is some great disparity in our ships, taken side by side with ships of other Navies, which I for one have never stated. In the table from which I am going to read, the advantage, if any, or the disadvantage, if any, will be on the side of the British Government, because while there are ships included in the list of all the four Navies which it is now the custom to call obsolescent, the obsolescence is by no means confined to the British Government, but extends in a greater degree, I believe, to other Governments. I have had the benefit of the advice in this matter of a former colleague, whose opinion is cited in the words I have just used, and when I tell the House the name of my adviser and friend, they will see at once the importance of the statement which he, through me, really makes—I mean Sir William White, the late Chief-Constructor of the Navy, who is responsible for the building of the greater part of the Fleet now in being. If you will permit me to quote a few figures, they are these. The battleship list, limited as I have described it, is as follows: Of ships now completed under twenty years of age, Great Britain has 52; Germany, 24; France, 20; the United States, 26. Now let me apply the two-Power standard; against our 52, in numbers of battleships, if we take France and Germany together we have to meet 44—that is, as against our 52, and taking France and the United States together we have 46 as against 52.

EARL CAWDOR: Twenty-four in Germany and 26 in the United States make 50, not 46.

LORD LOCHEE OF GOWRIE: I was taking France and the United States, and, as I say, they are together 46, against our 52. I am just coming to Germany and the United States. These permutations and commutations really are a little confusing. I admit that Germany and the United States between them have 50 battleships against our 52.

Now let me take tonnage. The tonnage of the British ships amounts to 753,900 tons; Germany, 282,700 tons; France, 230,200 tons; United States, 340,000 tons. Again applying the two-Power method, against our 750,000 odd of tons in battleships Germany and France have 512,900; France and the United States have 570,200; and Germany and the United States, which does become the second strongest Power, 622,700. The two next strongest Powers in battleships estimated in this way, give a tonnage 622,700 tons, against the 750,000 tons of Great Britain alone.

Now I come to the armoured cruiser. The armoured cruisers in the list run as follows: Great Britain, 38 in number; Germany, 8; France, 20; United States, 15. Applying the two-Power method we have this result; against our 38, France and Germany have 28; France and the United States have 35; and Germany and the United States, 23.

Now for the tonnage. If the House is not tired of these figures, I propose to give the tonnage. The armoured cruiser tonnage of Great Britain is 468,400. Against this we have in Germany, 78,500; in France, 185,000; and in the United States, 186,000. Applying once more the two-Power method we have against the 468,400 tons of armoured cruisers possessed by Great Britain, 263,500 in France and Germany, 371,000 in France and the United States, and 264,500 in Germany and the United States.

I am afraid I have exhausted the patience of noble Lords, but I would like just to pursue the subject one little bit further. I am going to mass these all together, because the order of merit is not the same in cruisers, if I may use that phrase, as it is in battleships. But let us combine the two. Putting battleships and armoured cruisers in one class by themselves—call them capital ships if you please—this is the result: Great Britain, 90; Germany, 32; France, 40; United States, 41. Then the tonnage is this, the gross British tonnage in armoured cruisers and battleships is 1,222,300, against the following:—Germany, 361,000; France, 415,000; the United States, 526,000.

Well, my Lords, those are the comparative figures of capital ships as I have described them, estimated in numbers and tonnage at the present moment, and I venture to be thus detailed in my statement of figures for three reasons: first of all, because I submit to the House that it justifies the statement that I was authorised to make by our naval colleagues in the spring, namely, that the shipbuilding programme of the present year, to which the noble Lord took gentle exception, is sufficient for the time being to maintain the two-Power standard. The second reason I may mention is this, that I think it confirms fully the statement made yesterday in another place by the Prime Minister as to the policy and practice of the Board of Admiralty for some years past. Finally, I mention it because I venture to think that it affords a satisfactory platform from which we may contemplate with composure the naval developments of the immediate future.

I have just a few words more to say. I resist the temptation which has been spread before the House on this occasion by the noble Earl to discuss the question of standards. I am not going to enter to-night into the battle of standards at all. Of course, I do not criticise the definition of the two-Power standard which was accepted the other day by the Prime Minister. That is not my purpose at all. But if I might presume to do so, I was going to express to the House the caution which I always try to impose upon myself in dealing as I often had to do in another place with this very question. I saw or foresaw certain difficulties and dangers connected with the standard. I agree absolutely with what was said about it by Mr. Balfour in another place this very year. He said that it had no scientific basis at all, nor has it. That means that it has no logical basis, and if it were to be set as a problem in logical difficulties, it would prove embarrassing to experts, and to the man in the street as well. I have always thought it wiser where you are dealing with the standard, which everybody confesses to be not a matter of science, not a matter of logic, not a matter of arithmetic, not a matter of precision, that the least said sometimes the soonest mended. I am certain of this, that whatever definition may be accepted for the moment and however well justified it may be at the moment, there is no possible formula of standard power, and no possible definition of any such standard which can be said for a moment to be entitled to hold water for all time. We do not know what circumstances may arise to lead to another standard and another definition having to be set up.

The only other point to which I want to refer may appear to some of your Lordships to be a little wide of the main scope of the discussion to-night, but I think I can bring what I have to say within the limits of order, certainly in this matter, although it is a little wide of the general tendency of the discussion. I want to allude for a moment to the international rule, and to its bearing on the present debate, which permits the destruction and capture of private property at sea. I am not going to discuss that rule on humanitarian grounds. My noble and learned friend the Lord Chancellor has expressed strong humanitarian views against the existing rule with which I entirely concur, but it is on naval grounds that I want to put the criticism that I am putting now, and on naval grounds bearing on the chief points raised by the noble Earl opposite. My Lords, apart from humanitarianism altogether, of which I take no account in these debates at all, I believe that the value of this rule as a weapon to us has been much exaggerated, and that its possible detriment to Great Britain is too much ignored. We have the largest target exposed to attack in this way of any country in the world. There is only one consolation—that the surface we expose to attack is so vast that its vastness in a sense is almost its own protection. I do not, therefore, value the rule as a naval weapon, but after many years reflection on these problems I have come to the conclusion that the existence in practice of this rule, by which a man's private property at sea is liable to be taken and destroyed, is the main cause of the large navies of the world. There is nothing in my judgment which more induces all nations to submit to the great burden of naval armaments than that fact, and I cannot too strongly express the great regret that I have always felt that the late Hague Conference produced no reform in international law in this respect. That was due no doubt largely to the opposition and resistance made to the proposed reform by the Government of this country of which I was myself a

Member. I am not challenging the grounds on which that resistance was offered, but I want to state the naval consequences, apart from your standards and definition of your standards once you have got the standards. The existence and continuance of this rule in practice renders it necessary for this country to possess a Navy, which I will not call a two or three-Power standard Navy, but a Navy which is a huge one. It makes it absolutely necessary, in my opinion, that our Navy should be enormous and invincible. The Hague Conference is not a popular subject to dilate upon and I am not going to do it, but I would remind your Lordships of this, that the first Hague Conference was called together for the main purpose, assented to by all nations, of reducing international armaments. What has been the result? I have not the figures exactly in my mind, but I think I am right when I say that between the first Hague Conference and the second, naval armaments went up 50 per cent. all the world over, Great Britain included, and I look forward with some foreboding to the developments in store for us in the few years which must elapse between the second Hague Conference and the third. I have to thank your Lordships for the great indulgence which you have extended to me.

***LORD LEITH OF FYVIE**: My Lords, some time ago I formed an opinion, which I expressed, with regard to the repairs of our Fleets. At the time I expressed that opinion I could not possibly have spoken from the experience that the country has since had, but experience since has shown that what I outlined and what I was suspected, was justified, and that our repairs have not been properly carried out; that is to say, that we had valuable machinery that we were spending a large amount of capital upon, but we were not keeping that machinery up, and that has been proved by the experience of the last three years, and more especially in the last year.

Your Lordships all know that a discussion took place in the other House on the question of the repairs of the Channel Fleet and also of the Mediterrannean Fleet and of the inefficiency of those Fleets at the time when they are required. They had to go into dock to be repaired; the estimate was that only two line of battleships should be absent from the Fleet at a time in order that the Fleet should be kept in being. We have had an example which has shown us that although we have this enormous Navy we cannot keep the Channel Fleet or the Mediterranean Fleet in being, and our Home Fleet is acknowledged to be only one-half manned by nucleus crews. The inconsistency of this enormous expenditure in machinery without the proper ratio of expenditure in repairs is the most dangerous thing of to-day. What is the good of our large Fleets unless they are ready for action? We are told in both Houses that they are ready for action, but when they are tested in any sense by manœuvres or otherwise it is proved that they are not and that there is a large amount of repairs due on each ship which it is recognised must be done before they can go into action. Not only that, but our Fleets are not ready for action even to be able to steam full speed from the Channel ports to Gibraltar. When the Home Fleet two years ago was organised, and then exhibited with spectacular effect to the Members of both Houses, they had a manœuvre soon after. What was the effect? The Admiralty ordered that the maximum speed was not to exceed 12 knots because there were so many ships that were out of repair—that had such a large amount of repair due to them that they could not go more than 12 knots. That means that all this enormous expenditure on the Navy represents capitalisation without the proper amount of repairs being kept up. We have had to-day a statement from the representative of the Admiralty in regard to the stores and ordnance. Why is it that the gun carriages and the ordnance cannot be got when you require them? I will tell you why. It is because foreigners have taken up the output that the works of this country can supply, simply because the Government does not lay out its contracts at a time when the works are able to put the work in hand

and to produce what is wanted and have it ready for the Government when it is required. The same thing applies to stores. We are told by His Majesty's Government that stores are being supplied in full quantities. I would ask you to go and inquire from any captain of a ship or any admiral of a fleet what his experience is. His experience is that he is not getting enough; the stores are being most niggardlily served out; they are being supplied on the basis not of what is required, but what the Admiralty have decided they can supply. These estimates are all wrong for supplies and ordnance. You can get both, and you have no business to be niggardly with them. Why you should not be niggardly is because of the common-sense view that you own a large and valuable plant and machinery, and owning that plant and machinery you ought to keep it up to the very best advantage. If you do not keep it up, when you require it it will fail you. That is the position that all men who are practically interested in machinery, who have to do with building ships and building guns, take up—that repairs are not properly kept up. They are demanded by admirals, captains, and engineers, and put on a list, but they are not carried out. The small repairs are carried out exceedingly well by the repair ships of the Fleet, but when it comes to capital repair, to the repair of battleships so that they may be ready for any contingency, they are not carried out. Several questions have been asked and answered, but have the answers been practical? Two years ago, on the Estimates of 1906, the late Premier said the Estimates were reduced on the distinct recommendation of the Sea Lords. That was rather a change from what had been the custom of the Admiralty before. The Sea Lords had never been brought so prominently before Parliament as they were on that occasion, but since then I have never heard the Sea Lords quoted in the way of stating what they wanted or what they recommended. Undoubtedly at that time, as the noble Earl who brought up the question has explained to you, there were many questions of expediency that could not be met in a moment, but to-day we have the Sea Lords perfectly silent on a most important question—one is the question brought up to-day, the homogeneousness of our Fleet, that battleships require cruisers, they also require destroyers, and these destroyers require torpedo boats, and beyond all the necessity of a dock and the planting of bases upon which all this valuable machinery can fall back in time of war. You have been told that there is a dock at Sheerness. I would like you to ask any admiral to take his fleet up to Sheerness in war time and take it into dock without buoys, which would have been removed. The answer is that there is a dock there, that there is water at the mouth of it, but the entrance is impracticable. The same thing can be said about Chatham—that it cannot be got at easily by these enormous battleships which are on the increase in size, and which you must all recognise are not less than a £2,000,000 investment. The whole consistency of our policy must be considered from the battleships down to the dock. We have gone on building battleships for the last three years and we are proposing to increase the number of them, but what are we going to do about docks? We are going to build Rosyth in ten years.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: Seven years.

*LORD LEITH OF FYVIE: Take even seven years—we want the dock built within two years. Where shall we be in seven years? We shall have forty more line-of-battleships in the North Sea and no more docks. Let us see if it is not possible to get docks from the commercial side on our coasts. Why cannot we subsidise those who build docks? Why cannot we subsidise a dock as well as subsidise a mail steamer? If we were to do that we should then have the benefit of a dock that was constantly in use and constantly paying for itself. I asked Lord Tweedmouth when this discussion came up two years ago whether it was possible to suggest that as a practicable question, and I understood that the matter had been considered by the Admiralty but had not got far enough. Since then I understand that one dock has been opened at Sunderland on the East Coast, and it is the only practicable one on that coast that will take in a ship like the "Dreadnought." It is only repeating over and over again what has been said before when I say that we are not carrying out a consistent policy. We are investing on top and not protecting the foundation. The foundation is from dock, destroyer, cruiser, up to battleship, and then when we have got the Fleets in being what we want is to know that they are practically employed. Are they practically employed? Has the Channel Fleet, or the Home Fleet been practically engaged in this last year? I say No, they have not. We ought to have had them properly employed so that as a combined Fleet they were defending the coast as it was the year before under Admiral Wilson. The experience of those Fleets in being under manœuvres and under night manœuvres and war tactics cannot be in any way estimated except by those who take part in them. In the past the Commanders-in-Chief down to the midshipmen have all had that experience, but this year they have not.

*LORD EVERSLEY: After the speech of my noble friend, Lord Lochee, I will not detain the House at any length, because I agree with him in almost everything that he said. But I should like to say a few words upon the question of the two-Power standard. I agree with my noble friend, Lord Lochee, that the two-Power standard has no logical basis; that it is a point on which you cannot lay down a standard as a matter of principle for all time to come. The noble Earl, in his opening statement, said that in the past the two-Power standard had been absolute and without qualification. I very well recollect the inception of the two-Power standard. I think that Lord George Hamilton was the first who suggested it as an alternative to the policy which had previously been adopted. For a great many years previous to 1887 or 1888 the standard of strength adopted for the British Navy was that of three to two, as compared with the French Navy. That, I believe, had been the standard adopted from the end of the great French War until the time I speak of, and as a matter of fact when either Power increased its Navy somewhat above that proportion the other was certain to follow suit, and that standard was considered sufficient by naval authorities and by successive Governments for many years until 1887 or 1888. About that time, however, the increase of the Russian Navy and the close alliance between Russia and France made it expedient and necessary to adopt another standard, and Lord George Hamilton was, I believe, the first to suggest the two-Power standard. The noble Lord said that it had been absolute and unqualified.

EARL CAWDOR: I do not wish to interrupt. When I said the statement had been absolute and unqualified, I referred to the statement made by the Prime Minister two or three days ago.

*LORD EVERSLEY: I am going to show that it was not without qualification when it was first suggested by Lord George Hamilton. I have not been able to find the first speech in which Lord George Hamilton suggested the standard, but I find a reference to it in a later speech of his in the year 1893. In 1893 Lord George Hamilton made an important speech on the naval expenditure, very much like the speech which the noble Earl has made to-night, namely, he called upon the Government quite late in the session, I think in December, to lay their programme for the next year before the House, and in that speech he dealt with a two-Power standard. He said that it was admitted to be a cardinal part of the policy of this country that the minimum standard of security which the country demanded and expected was that our Fleet should be equal to the combination of the two next strongest navies in Europe, namely, France and Russia, and in the same speech he went on to say—

> "When the late Government introduced the Naval Defence Act of 1889 they undertook that if a certain sum of money was placed at their disposal, in the year 1894 the British Fleet would be equal to the combined force of any two navies in Europe."

That restriction to Europe is a very important qualification, and for my part I think it is a very wise one. Personally I should look with some dread at the inclusion of the United States in any race of armaments with this country. I believe it is wise to exclude the United States Navy from any consideration of the two-Power standard. The point is not a very material one at the present moment, because, as the figures of my noble friend Lord Lochee show, the present strength of the British Navy as compared with either France, Germany or the United States, is very great, but in respect to the United States the question might become a material and important one in the near future, and I would put this point to the noble Lord opposite: whether if the United States Government should consider it desirable to increase largely their fleet with a view of having a large fleet in the Pacific, it would be wise for this country immediately to increase its own Fleet in the same proportion.

I venture to say that that is a proposition about which I feel considerable doubt, and whenever the time comes when it may be the subject of discussion, all I can say is that I do not think it would be a wise thing on the part of this country to lay down as a proposition for all time to come that the United States should be included in the two-Power standard. My noble friend Lord Lochee has given figures to show the great strength of the British Fleet at the present moment. I think the noble Earl in his speech has hardly done credit to himself or to the Government of which he was a member. He, to my mind, has failed to recognise the enormous strength of the British Fleet as compared with the fleets of other Powers at the present moment.

Earl CAWDOR: The noble Lord must pardon me for interrupting him again. I was perfectly definite on that point. I said that so far as the present supremacy of our Fleet was concerned I believed it to be absolute. I accepted it as being absolute at the present time, and therefore I did not pass it by.

*Lord EVERSLEY: Certainly the impression on my mind was that the noble Earl had not dwelt sufficiently on the present existing strength of the Navy, and I think it is right to mention that not only is that due to the noble Lord and to the great exertions of the late Government during the ten years that they held office, but also the fact that our relative strength to other Powers has been enormously increased by their policy in regard to agreements with France and Japan which have enabled the concentration of our battleships in home waters. The figures of my noble friend Lord Lochee showed that in respect to the other three great Powers, the two-Power standard is enormously exceeded in all three cases, and as regards Germany the figures show that the strength of the British Fleet at the present moment, at least in battleships and armoured cruisers, is three times and possibly four times greater than that of Germany. That has, as I have said, an important bearing on the present question. If it were not for one important fact I believe it would be possible to make a considerable reduction in naval expenditure at the present time. That one fact I need hardly say is the prospective great increase of the German Navy. But we must recollect that that prospective great increase in the German Navy has to be spread over a considerable number of years. It is not to be completed until the year 1820. By that time no doubt Germany will have a very formidable fleet of these bigger vessels. During the same time France also has a considerable programme of shipbuilding, although not more than one half of that of Germany. It is part of the German programme to build the greater number of these vessels in the earlier years and the lesser number in the later years. If it were possible for this country to adopt the plan of the German Government and to have a definite statutory programme spreading over the next twelve years, to be completed by the year 1920, and to equalise the Votes during that period and spend rather a larger amount during the earlier years and less in the later years, to build a larger amount of tonnage in the earlier years, and a somewhat less amount of tonnage in the later years, it would be, I think, an easy matter to provide for the two-Power standard at the end of that period sufficiently to meet the programmes both of France and of Germany without any large addition to our shipbuilding Vote. But the difficulty arises from the fact that I have mentioned, that the additions to be made to the German Fleet during the next four or five years will be much larger than in the subsequent years. It may well be, therefore, that during the next three or four years it may be necessary to make some addition to the shipbuilding Vote. I doubt whether it will be necessary to do so to the extent mentioned by the noble Lord opposite, but that is a matter that will have to be considered carefully by those responsible for the naval programme in the next year. I would venture to suggest this to the Government, whether if it be necessary to make a considerable addition to the shipbuilding Vote in the next three or four years it may not be possible to effect some reduction in other parts of the naval expenditure. I believe it is commonly considered that the great increase of expenditure upon the Navy during the last ten years has been wholly due to the shipbuilding Vote. That is very far from being the case. The total increase of expenditure upon the Navy during the last ten years amounts to no less than £10,500,000. Of that sum only £1,000,000 is due to the increase of the shipbuilding Vote. The shipbuilding Vote ten years ago was £7,000,000. It is now £8,000,000. Of the £10,500,000, £1,500,000 is due to the interest on Sinking Fund upon money borrowed for new works of all kinds—for docks and harbours and the dredging of harbours, and so forth—all over the world, and that perhaps ought not to be included in any comparison at the present moment with the expenditure of ten years ago. But of the remaining £8,000,000, £3,500,000 is due to the increase of wages and victualling of the men; something like £1,250,000 is due to the increased cost of repairs, and something like £1,000,000 is due to the increased cost of coal, and in that way we mount up to no less than £8,000,000 increase due to the *personnel* of the Fleet. During that time the *personnel* of the Fleet has been increased by 28,000 men; it has been raised from 100,000 to 128,000 men. At the present moment the number of men in the German Navy is 50,000, and the number of men in the French Navy is 56,000. It will be seen, therefore, that the two-Power standard is enormously exceeded in respect of the *personnel* of the British Fleet. It has been often contended by men of very high authority in the Navy that it would be wise policy on the part of the British Admiralty to adopt more freely the short-service system and to pass a larger number of men more rapidly through the Service into the Reserve, and if this policy were adopted it would be possible without any real reduction in the efficiency of the Fleet to make a very considerable reduction in the wages Vote and other Votes for the Navy. It would also be possible, if that policy were adopted, considerably to reduce the number of vessels in commission, and consequently the cost of their repairs and coals. I venture to suggest for the consideration of the Government of the Navy Estimates and the programme for next year, whether, if it should be necessary largely to increase the shipbuilding Vote, it might not be at the same time accompanied by some reduction of other Votes. I would venture to point out to the House that of the total expenditure of this country a very much smaller amount is spent upon the building of new ships than is the case with either Germany or France. Of the total expenditure of Germany upon the Navy, namely, of £16,000,000 during the present year, no less than £8,000,000 is spent upon new ships, in other words, one-half, and the other £8,000,000 is spent upon their *personnel*. In the case of England out of a total expenditure of £32,500,000, only £8,000,000 is spent upon new ships, the residue being spent upon the *personnel* and the other matters to which I have adverted. Therefore, while in Germany one-half of the total expenditure is spent upon new ships, in England only one-fourth is so spent, and that seems to me also to point to the possibility of effecting a reduction in other parts of the naval service if we are called upon to spend a much larger amount upon the *materiel*. However, those are matters which as I have said must be considered by the Government in determining the programme for next year. I join with all that has been said by my noble friends, Lord Granard and Lord Loches, as to the inexpediency of forcing the hands of the Government to declare their programme in the month of November for next year. When we consider that by the beginning of March it will be the duty of the Minister in charge of the Naval Estimates to state to the country what the programme of the Government for the coming year is, it seems to me that the wise course is to leave it there, and not prematurely to force their hands.

I may remind the House that the last attempt made in this direction was in the year 1893. Lord George Hamilton then brought forward a Motion in the other House calling upon the Government to declare its programme for the coming year. The Motion was very strongly opposed by Mr. Gladstone in a very notable speech, and he made these remarks which I think are equally applicable to the remarks of the noble Lord opposite on the present occasion. He said—

> "We rest on the principle of annual account, annual proposition, and annual approval by the House of Commons, which we say is the only way of maintaining regularity, and that regularity is the only talisman which will secure Parliamentary control. If you resort to irregular periods, irregular proposals in moments of chance excitement without real danger, you destroy all powers which the House of Commons, pressed as it is by business from day to day, can possibly possess, of exercising efficient control over the executive Government."

Those observations seem to me to apply equally to the present time, and to the speech of the noble Lord opposite, and for my part, although I think I have made some observations containing suggestions to the Government as to what they should entertain with a view to their programme of next year, I have done so with no desire to force their hands or to compel or induce them at the present time to state their programme. I have done so with a desire that these matters should be carefully considered before the programme for next year is finally resorted to. For my part I think, looking back at the enormous increase of expenditure on the Navy during the last three years—it has increased by no less than £20,000,000 within the last twenty years, £10,000,000 of that increase being in the last ten years, and I cannot look but with dismay to the further increase which seems to be indicated by the noble Lord opposite. I believe that sound finance and light taxation and the power of borrowing money largely whenever emergency occurs is at least as important to the safety and to the strength of the country as the multiplying of military and naval armaments and the multiplication of ships which probably will become obsolete in the course of a few years.

*LORD BRASSEY: My Lords, as the important subject which the noble Lord opposite who lately presided at the Board of Admiralty so fittingly brought before us has already been exhaustively discussed by previous speakers I have but very few words to offer to your Lordships.

As to the superior position of the Navy at the present time no doubt exists. When we compare the amounts voted for construction for the Navy of Great Britain and for the Navies of other countries, more especially Germany, it is clear that we are falling behind. I find myself in accord with the noble Lord, Lord Cawdor, when he insists upon the necessity of laying down six capital ships if we are to maintain the two-Power standard in relation to construction—four ships to be laid down with as little delay as possible and pushed forward vigorously, and two ships to be laid down later on.

The requirements for the British Navy are not limited to "Dreadnoughts" and their auxiliaries, and to the torpedo flotilla of which Lord Cawdor has spoken. The "Dreadnoughts" and the "Invincibles" are ships specially adapted for service on the high seas. The excellence of the designs of those ships for the service for which they are best adapted has recently been commended by all the foreign authorities who have discussed this subject. The value of the type is established by its universal adoption by all the maritime Powers for service on the high seas. In coastal waters big ships are exposed to grave risks. For the inshore squadron a type of ship quite different from the "Dreadnought" and the "Invincible" is required. It would not be true to say that the Admiralty has neglected the in-shore squadron. That branch of naval construction should be pushed with more vigour. The naval experience and the professional skill which have given us the "Dreadnought" and the "Invincible" should now be directed to the in-shore squadron. If a new type can be devised, possibly an armoured destroyer, the effect may be to cause some hesitation among all naval Powers as to the desirability of building ships of ever-growing dimensions for all purposes.

Looking to the general position of the country, there is evidently nothing to justify a scare. The noble Lord, Lord Cawdor, has expressed his satisfaction with our present strength in ships. As my noble friend, Lord Eversley, has said, in manning we are far above the two-Power standard. Then, again, we have the great advantage of possessing a chain of foreign stations extending round the globe. Upon that point I would venture to observe that we are not destitute of places in which our Fleets may anchor on the East Coast. We have the splendid natural harbour of Cromarty, which is now the headquarters of our Fleets when at exercise in that part of the German Ocean.

It is regrettable that in times of peace it should be necessary to impose large additional burdens on the taxpayers. It is desirable on political grounds that the laying-down programme in the next Navy Estimates should be of an ample nature. If the laying-down programme is inadequate those discussions as to the strength of the Navy, which we all regret, will recur again and again. They do not make for friendly relations between ourselves and foreign countries.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: I propose to occupy your Lordships only for a moment, but as by the rules of your Lordships' House my noble friend is unable to rise again, I should like to say that should the debate terminate with the statements which have been made up to now from the Government Bench, I fear there will be very considerable disappointment and dissatisfaction among those who are interested in naval affairs. Last night we had a discussion in which the Government were pressed to make a definite declaration on a matter of the most urgent national importance, and their apparent irresolution on that question will, I think, cause comment, and has caused comment, as may be seen by those who have read to-day's papers, and in some degree we are in the same position to-night.

I need hardly say that I take no exception to the manner or to the method of the noble Earl who speaks for the Admiralty in this House, and who always speaks, if I may venture to say so, with full command of every subject which he undertakes. But the noble Earl cannot go beyond the information which is supplied to him from the Admiralty, and in this case I think I should be inclined to say of him, as was said by the Yankee publican who saw Niagara for the first time, that it would have been splendid but for the poverty of the material.

We are really hardly answered on the main points on which Lord Cawdor has pressed the Government to-night. Speaker after speaker has given explanations which do not bear on the subject which was immediately uppermost in the mind of the noble Earl behind me. The noble Lord who spoke for the first time, I think, in this House, and whom I had the pleasure of listening to very often in another place, spoke strongly as to our present relative superiority to foreign naval Powers, but that was not the point on which Lord Cawdor pressed for an explanation from the Government. It is admitted at this moment that the Navy has been fully maintained, but his apprehension was that in 1911 under the programmes of which we are aware by other Powers, we shall fall short in battleships and in the accompanying expenditure on battleships, unless more ships are laid down at a very early date than we have yet had a pledge from the Government to lay down.

The noble Lord also pressed on the House our position with regard to a base in the North Sea. I am not experienced enough to say whether it is possible for the Government to make a more satisfactory reply than they have made on that subject, but to tell us that the best we can hope—and even that is only a hope—is that we may have some docks in seven years time is certainly no encouraging at a moment coming closely after such a debate as that of last night.

Then again I am sure that the House and the country would have welcomed a more definite statement as to guns and mountings. My noble friend behind me, Lord Leith, told the House that our difficulty in getting guns and mountings delivered up to time was that the plant of many of the largest contractors was taken up by foreign orders placed at the right time—when ours were not. I do not for a moment say that that is the case, but I think that thet demands an answer and a refutation, if refutation can be given, from the Government Bench.

The noble Lord who spoke a few moments ago, Lord Eversley, told the House of the apprehension with which he views the enormous growth of naval expenditure. He said that there had been £10,000,000 in ten years added to the Estimates, or £20,000,000 in twenty years, and that that was an enormous addition. I entirely concur with him, but some of us have thought, if we were to go into the regions of finance, that a Government which has before it expenditure vouched for by the Prime Minister in his undertaking to keep up the standard of two Powers, was unwise, to say the least of it, in discarding £3,000,000 of revenue this year from the sugar duties, and so placing himself in a position of great inconvenience, and possibly even of danger, next year, and my noble friend pressed strongly on the Government that they are by not laying down battleships at this moment transferring to the subsequent years a financial burden which it may then be extremely inconvenient to bear. We all know that in naval matters it is absolutely necessary, if possible, to distribute the financial burden, so that there shall not be an undue pressure on the Admiralty by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in any year to reduce Estimates, especially at a time when we have a falling revenue.

I believe the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Duchy is about to rise, and I venture to urge him, as he always speaks with the utmost clearness, to give us as definite an undertaking in this matter as he possibly can. It is not for us on this side of the House to estimate exactly the effect of the Government plan of meeting serious Motions, pressed with all due courtesy, as we hope, with absolutely inconclusive replies. We are not in a position in this House, as the House of Commons is, to stop supplies, or to take any strong measure of that kind, but if we are to judge by what we see in the public Press, if we are to judge by the effect of these debates on the public mind throughout the country, they certainly have a most damaging effect in the direction of destroying confidence in the intentions of the Government.

We believe and fully credit the desire and determination of the Government to adhere to the two-Power standard, but we would urge that with regard to points such as those Lord Cawdor has made, in which you cannot overtake a mistake or an omission to lay down battleships, which he, with his great experience, now declares that the Government should lay down, we may be given the best assurances that can be given to allay the feeling which has arisen on this matter.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, may I, with the permission of the House, be allowed to make one remark in answer to my noble friend Lord Midleton. He said that I had made no statement with regard to what the position of the country would be after the year 1911. I mentioned that at the end of 1911 the Germans would have thirteen "Dreadnoughts" and "Invincibles," and that we should have twelve. I then went on further to state that all the ships which we proposed building under next year's programme would be completed by the end of 1911. The noble Lord misquoted me there; he said that I made no mention in regard to that.

Then with reference to gun-mountings the same observation applies. I stated that the Admiralty would see that all fittings and gun-mountings and guns, etc., were delivered in time for the ships of this year's programme being completed by 1911.

I do not think there is anything else to reply to except perhaps with regard to the question Lord Leith raised about repairs, and also with regard to the exercise of the Home Fleet Division. I may say with regard to the Home Fleet Division that they were exercised this year and the result was extremely satisfactory in every way, in fact they compared very favourably with any of the other Fleets which are in regular commission. As your Lordships are aware the Home Fleet is a nucleus Fleet and have only three-fifths of the complement on board, the other two-fifths making up the full complement being in shore establishments.

As to the other question that was raised with regard to subsidising private docks, as far as that is concerned, the Government have had no offer from any private firm in the direction of subsidising any dock, and of course a dock such as would take a "Dreadnought," would not be of much use on the East Coast, unless there were adequate fortifications surrounding it.

I think there is nothing else to add, except to say as regards the two-Power standard that we have nothing to add to what the Prime Minister said on that subject.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH rose, "To ask the Government if they do not deem it advisable to make a statement of their intentions in connection with the building of men-of-war, and to produce Supplementary Estimates for that purpose before Christmas instead of waiting until next Easter; and also to ask them if they do not think that it would be expedient to construct large docks at Chatham and other eastern ports by means of a loan which should be paid off in about twenty years time, as such docks, if constructed, would be of considerable value at the end of that period, as is the case with many of our existing docks of far greater antiquity." The noble Lord said: My Lords, I shall confine my remarks to the desirability of constructing large docks on the East Coast by means of loans. I admit it would be difficult for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to raise next year by taxation the money that we shall require for ships as well as docks. I therefore consider it justifiable finance to borrow the money necessary for the purpose of building docks and to arrange for a sinking fund so as to pay off that loan in twenty years time. When the twenty years are out, we should still have valuable docks fully suitable for what will be the second-class ships of 1928, even if they are not suitable for the first-class ships of that date, whereas if there is a loan for shipbuilding, the ships themselves would be of little value after twenty years. For instance, if you look at our present dockyards, a large part of the masonry forming the older parts of the dockyard built previous to 1850 when sailing went out and steam came in, is all there in use at the present day, and is probably still worth 5s. in the £ of what was spent on it, and it remains to us as a valuable legacy from our ancestors.

With regard to Chatham, my remarks on that head are rather dependent upon the Port of London Bill deepening the access to that yard sufficient to allow a wounded "Dreadnought" 3 feet down by the bow, and with a heel of several degrees being able to get up to Chatham. If that cannot be arranged for, there are other docks on the East Coast which should be deepened in order to be able to receive a water-logged vessel with a heavy list.

There are two docks at Chatham that were already in existence at the time when Mr. Secretary Pepys was writing his Diaries at the Admiralty, Docks No. 2 and No. 4. Dock No. 2 was built in the time of James I. Its length at that time was about 200 feet and its depth 14 feet 6 inches. Fifty years ago the wood in that dock was replaced by granite, and its length was increased to 345 feet 6 inches, and its depth to 23 feet 7 inches, In 1860 and in 1866 I see that its length was again increased, so that it is now 404 feet long. The work done in excavating in the time of James I. is still of use, and posterity is still benefiting by it.

To take Dock No. 4, that dock was built before the year 1688, and was then apparently about the same size as No. 2. It has been repeatedly lengthened and improved, work is going on upon it now, and it is to be 331 feet long. So that much of the work done in the reigns of Charles II., George III., William IV. and in the first half of Queen Victoria's reign is still of use and of value to the country.

Between 1871 and 1873 Docks Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 were built at Chatham, all of which, though at least thirty-five years old, are still of use. About five years ago there was a scheme before the Admiralty for building a basin with additional large docks at St. Mary's Island, Chatham, which was at one time, I understand, said to be approved of by the Admiralty, but it has not yet been carried out. I think it is high time that that particular scheme should be reconsidered. Under the Port of London Bill, the Thames is to be deepened. And, you do deepen the Thames, Chatham becomes easy of access, and one of the chief objections to large docks at Chatham will have disappeared. Furthermore, it is a very difficult place for an enemy to get up to, which is an avadntage that some of the other docks we are thinking of building do not possess.

I do not wish to weary the House by giving you the history of Plymouth or Portsmouth Dockyards. I think that I have said enough to show the desirability of building fresh docks on the East Coast where our largest ships can be docked and promptly repaired, and I think I have proved that if the country were to borrow the money and docks were constructed by means of a loan with twenty years to run, the country would still have good value left in those docks at the end of the twenty years.

After the victory of Camperdown the relative importance of our eastern dockyards declined, and our expenditure on docks was concentrated on those in our Channel ports. But of late years our supremacy on the North Sea has been threatened by another Power infinitely greater than that of Holland, inasmuch as she disposes of large armies as well as an increasing Fleet, so that our eastern yards have resumed their importance, and they should be improved and put on a war footing without delay and made capable of docking large ships. I gather that the Admiralty are expediting work at Rosyth. If so, I am glad of it, and I hope they will continue to do so, and if possible that they will reduce the seven years to five years. But a dock at Chatham large enough to take a damaged "St. Vincent" ought also to be commenced at once.

The *Globe* of August 24th says that—

> "Kiel has two, docks, and Wilhelmshaven has one dock capable of taking in the latest battleships, while the Kaiser Dock of the North German Lloyd at Bremen, and the floating dock of Blohm and Voss at Hamburg can receive the new battle-ships in case of need. Two huge dry docks are now nearing completion in the shipbuilding yard of Wilhelmshaven. Near Brunsbuttel, the North Sea opening of the Kiel Canal, two more large dry docks are to be built, while Blohm and Voss and the Vulcan Shipbuilding Yard are building on the Elbe two floating docks, each of 30,000 tons capacity. As there are rumours of a large floating dock to be built at Kiel, the German Navy will have sufficient dock accommodation for its biggest vessels in the near future."

The country that has the command of the seas, must have docks as well as battleships, and the fewer days a ship is away from her station for repairs the better. Further, she runs the risk of being attacked while she is in a crippled state, and the nearer she is to some safe place, some rabbit-hole as it were, into which she can run, the better. We require a double dock standard as well as a double ship standard in the North Sea.

I now put the Question that stands in my name.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, the question raised by my noble friend Lord Ellenborough, with regard to docks, has been very carefully considered by the Government on many occasions, and I may say that the special dock to which he drew our attention and the suggestion he made that Chatham should be deepened and made into a suitable dock has been before the Admiralty quite recently, and it is, in fact, under the consideration of the Admiralty at the present moment. I understand, however, that there are some very great difficulties—I believe nearly insuperable difficulties—in the case of Chatham with regard to the channel, and it is very doubtful whether the Admiralty will be able to see their way to recommend the deepening of the channel, and the expense that would involve in order to make it a dock that would take a "Dreadnought."

The noble Lord also mentioned that there were very few docks on the south coast——

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: No, on the east coast. We have quite enough docks on the south coast. We are well provided there, except that you ought to finish the new dock at Portsmouth on which the work is going forward now, I believe.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: Yes, the noble Lord is perfectly correct. Work is going on at the dock at Portsmouth and that dock will shortly be completed. Then the noble Lord suggested that money should be borrowed on the system that was in vogue some years ago under the Naval Loans Act, by which these docks could be paid for, and he very justly stated that money borrowed in this way would be liable in the case of docks where the material and the docks remained for a great length of time to be of value to the country still in twenty years time, whereas the life of a battleship is only twenty years, and it is not of very great value at the end of that time. I will place the points which have been raised by my noble friend before the Admiralty, and I am sure they will give them due consideration.

THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the fact that these Islands mainly depend for their food supply upon the ships of the mercantile marine, and to point out the serious danger involved in having any of our merchant ships commanded or officered by foreigners; and to move to resolve: "That it is the opinion of this House that, for the better defence of this country, the Government should forbid the granting of Board of Trade certificates for competency as masters or mates to any who are not British subjects."

Yesterday there was a most interesting debate in your Lordships' House on the Motion of the noble and gallant Field-Marshal Lord Roberts. As far as I could gather, everybody in this House admitted the necessity of having a defending Army, though there was a variance of opinion as to what the strength of that Army should be and as to how it should be formed. To-day we have had the subject of the Navy brought up, and I think that every one in this House is also in agreement that we should have a powerful and efficient Navy. Has it ever struck any of your Lordships that our Royal Navy and our Army are perfectly useless without the merchant navy? This may seem very startling, but it is the absolute truth, and in very few words I think I can show your Lordships that it is so.

England depends entirely on the three services—the Royal Navy, the Merchant Navy, and the Army; and if you take any one of these away, the other two alone will not be of much service. Of the three services, the merchant navy is the oldest, and it is the one that has laid the foundations of the British Empire. The noble and gallant Earl stated yesterday that the defending Army should be at least a million of men. Well, my Lords, even if you had that million of men, if you had ten millions of men, if every able-bodied man in the United Kingdom was a highly trained soldier, they would be useless for defence without your merchant navy. It is perfectly true that they could repel all invasion from Continental Powers, but there is one enemy that they could not repel without the ships of the merchant service, and that is starvation. Take away the ships of the merchant service and in a very short time your defending Army would be starved into submission. The ships of the Royal Navy would be no use under such conditions, for they have not the stowage room to carry sufficient food supplies, and many of the naval ships would be rendered inefficient for want of the merchant ships to carry them coal and other supplies.

My Lords, in this House and the House of Commons, and in the public Press, the claims and requirements of both our Army and Navy are constantly being put forward, and rightly; but where do we ever see the claims of the merchant service put forward? From the time when the Navigation Laws were repealed —which laws, my Lords, will have to be re-enacted sooner or later if England is to maintain her position as a great Power—from that time until now, what encouragement has been given to the men of the merchant service, to the officers of the merchant service, or to the shipowners? It is true there is one instance where the Government advanced a very large sum of money at a very low rate of interest to the Cunard Company and gave them a large yearly subsidy, but this was simply for the building of the two large turbine liners.

The subject of the Motion now before your Lordships is no new one. I introduced it as a Bill in 1905, and on several previous occasions I have brought it before this House. As your Lordships know, we depend very largely for the food supplies of these Islands on the products of other countries. Grain, meat, and other food supplies come to us from practically all over the world—from Canada, from California, from Russia, from Australia, the Argentine Republic, and other places; and any stoppage of these supplies for any length of time would mean starvation, or very nearly starvation, amongst the inhabitants of the United Kingdom.

In the mercantile marine there are, approximately, 1,900 officers and 25,000 men who belong to the Royal Naval Reserve. Most of these officers and men are sailing in our liners. In the event of a war with a great naval Power, all these officers and men would be required to serve in the Royal Navy. Their places in the liners would have to be filled by British captains and officers taken from what are miscalled the tramps of our merchant service, which I would remind your Lordships are the vessels that carry our food supplies. A liner takes far more officers than a tramp of the same size. The men also, the British seamen, would be taken to supply the deficiencies amongst the crews of the liners. The result would be that we would have to depend on ships carrying our food supplies commanded, officered, and manned by foreigners, and this cannot but be regarded as a serious danger to this country. The percentage of aliens in our tramps is over 50 per cent.; there are 472 alien captains and officers, and there are, according to the latest Returns, 3,297 alien petty officers, numbers of whom, I dare say, are aspiring to hold higher grades. Not only that, but there is a most pernicious practice, or was up to very lately, of carrying foreign boys as apprentices in British ships, and after four years service they will, of course, wish to obtain British certificates in order to get higher pay. It is only this very year that we discussed the subject of a new training ship started by the White Star Line for officers, and it does seem to me to be a most unfair and unjust thing to induce young English boys to enter the British merchant service and then, after they have obtained their certificates, for them to find that the posts they might reasonably expect to occupy are taken by aliens.

Lord Muskerry.

The Admiralty have always recognised the principle of this Motion, because whenever they charter any of our merchant ships they not only insist on their being commanded and officered by British subjects and containing a large proportion of British seamen in the crew, but they also, in many cases, require all the crew to be British subjects. One example of this was the case of the S.S. "Powderham." When she was lying in a Continental port she shipped a number of alien seamen and firemen. She then came over to this country, and was chartered by the Admiralty to carry Government stores to South Africa. On reaching London the captain was compelled by the Admiralty to discharge the alien crew, and he had to give them one month's pay in lieu of notice. Even supposing a ship were manned and officered by British subjects and had only an alien captain, this would be still a most serious danger. We may assume that the captain would certainly be the first, and possibly the only one, on board to hear that war had broken out, and if he were a subject of the Power with which we might be at war, what would be more easy than for him to take the ship into a port belonging to the enemy, where the first thing the British officers and crew would know of war having broken out would be finding themselves prisoners and the ship's cargo in the hands of the enemy? The captain could easily inform his officers that he had received orders from his owners to deliver the cargo at this particular port. If such a state of things existed as the noble and gallant Field Marshal in his Motion yesterday desired to meet by having an efficient defending Army, then the loss of even one ship conveying food supplies would be a very serious matter to this country.

On former occasions I have been told that there was no need to do anything to prevent foreigners commanding and officering British ships, as they were not increasing in numbers. With all due respect, there is no sense in such a reply. The existence of even one alien commander is a menace; but where you have 472 alien commanders and officers this is a still more serious danger. Now, for one moment I will just deal with this argument. It is said there is no need to put a stop to foreigners obtaining certificates because they are not increasing in numbers. If that be so, why is there any objection to forbid any further certificates being granted to aliens? Or is there a desire on the part of a Government Department that more aliens should come into the merchant service? If that is the case, I could understand the unpatriotic refusal to forbid foreigners taking out certificates; but, if it is not so, there is neither rhyme nor reason in refusing to take what is a very obvious precaution, and one which most, if not all, of the leading maritime Powers have already taken to safeguard their mercantile marine.

My Lords, it is no good providing a large defensive Army for this country if you do not at the same time make sure that it will be properly fed. I venture to read once again the statement made in the House of Commons in February, 1900, by the then President of the Board of Trade—

> "Take, for instance, the question of a war—the question of a war where the Naval Reserve were called out—that would be to deplete British ships of British seamen, and instead of being partially manned by foreigners they would, under existing circumstances, be altogether manned by foreigners. That, I think, is matter for very great regret, and if any suggestion can be made to remedy that state of things or to endeavour to remedy that state of things, which the whole House regrets, then the House would do wrong not to consider any suggestion that might be made."

This Motion is a suggestion to remedy the state of things alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman. The other alternative is to build huge State granaries and large stores for frozen meat, and keep immense supplies of corned and tinned provisions on hand. This, I need hardly say, would cost a very large sum of money and lock up a large amount of capital. According to the last available figures—that is, for the year 1906——the over-sea imports during the year on a c.i.f. valuation were: grain, flour, and meat, £119,907,042. Other foods came to £68,823,115. Then there were certain dutiable foods and drinks, which came to £44,709,172, making a total value of over-sea imports of £233,439,329. This, my Lords, will give some idea of how dependent this country is on over-sea food supplies.

As I have already told your Lordships, there are, approximately, 25,000 British seamen in the Royal Naval Reserve. From the latest Returns I find that in the merchant service there are only 28,106 British seamen, and 5,946 British petty officers, making a total of 34,052 Britishers. If you take away the 25,000 men of the Naval Reserve, that will only leave us 9,052 British seamen to man our huge merchant fleet. There are, of course, 44,367 lascars, who are mostly British subjects, but they will only be employed in Eastern waters. This is a very, very serious state of affairs, and it shows how vitally necessary it is that we should insist on all our ships being commanded and officered by British subjects. It would be impossible, of course, as things stand at present, to ensure that all the crews, or even a large proportion of them, should be British, but it is a very easy matter to ensure that they carry British captains and officers. My Lords, it is nearly eight years since the speech from which I quoted was made in the House of Commons; but up to now not one thing has been done to remedy what was admitted to be a grave and serious evil. I trust your Lordships will accept my Motion. It is a terrible thing to think that England, who has been called "the Mistress of the Seas," should have to depend in war time on foreigners for the sailing of her mercantile ships.

Moved to resolve, "That it is the opinion of this House that, for the better defence of this country, the Government should forbid the granting of Board of Trade certificates for competency as masters or mates to any who are not British subjects."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

*Lord ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I think that in future no certificate of competency to act as master or mate should be granted to any foreigner. But I would allow a foreigner to be shipped at some foreign ports, or at some of the smaller colonial harbours, to fill up vacancies caused by sickness or death, so as to enable a ship to be safely navigated. It would be hard on owners and still harder on the crew, if they were kept in unhealthy harbours, such as exist on the African coast, for want of a navigator. This, however, should be only a temporary mitigation of the law, and the foreign navigator should be discharged whenever the ship reached a port where there were facilities for obtaining British-born men with certificates of competency. I myself drew up clauses which, if added to the Bill brought in by the noble Lord on a former occasion, would have met this difficulty. If you warn British ships against possible capture when war is imminent, you put it in the power of an alien to betray you. You also place the crew in a most unfair position. If the alien captain is a belligerent, you make mutiny a duty that the crew owe to their country. If the alien is a neutral, you cannot hang him for high treason. Aliens should never be put in a *quasi*-magisterial position with a British crew. Then there is the argument that you would be driving ships to take refuge under a foreign flag if they could not be commanded by an alien. If they do hoist another flag, why, so much the better for British commerce. I think that, on inquiry, it will be found that most of the ships commanded by aliens are also really owned by aliens; that they have nothing British about them except the flag, and put no money into British pockets. They only fly our flag because we have a powerful Navy and efficient Consulates.

*Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL: My Lords, the noble Lord who has placed this Motion on the Paper asked where the claims of the officers and men of the merchant service were ever put forward. I think he supplies his own answer, because the able and frequent manner in which he calls attention to the interests of those men is well known to your Lordships. Of all the questions connected with the merchant service which he is in the habit of raising, this one must be his favourite, for I find, on looking through the Journals of the House, that he has introduced Bills dealing with this question on no fewer than five occasions within the last ten years. I do not find, however, that he has so far induced your Lordships to read any one of those Bills a second time. Knowing the noble Lord as we do, I do not think that any of us are surprised to find him returning again to the charge.

From the point of view of the officers of the merchant service, with whom the noble Lord is in such close touch, there must, of course, be a great deal to be said in favour of the exclusion of foreigners from their ranks. Indeed, I think that, speaking as a general proposition, we should all be very glad if it were possible to arrive at a state of affairs of that kind; but I will show, in a moment, a few reasons which prevent us from arriving at that point. But that is not the ground on which the noble Lord brings forward his Motion. He calls attention to the fact that these islands depend upon outside sources for their food supply, and to the danger of having any of our merchant ships officered by foreigners on account of that fact. I found it a little difficult to understand exactly the nature of the danger which the noble Lord anticipated, but he has made that clear in the course of his speech. What I understand he is afraid of is that in time of war a ship bringing food supplies to this country may be commanded by a foreigner, and that instead of doing his best to bring the ship safely to port in this country, he will hand her over to the enemy. If there was any fear of that being done on at all a large scale, the prospect would be a very alarming one.

But, after all, what are the facts? The proportion of foreigners holding Board of Trade certificates of competency as masters and mates does not amount to quite 2 per cent. of the whole number, and the danger which arises from that small proportion would be further reduced by the fact that those men may belong to any one of many foreign nations. Therefore, the number who might be presumed to owe allegiance to the country with which we were at war, would be very much smaller than that. We must also remember that we have the owners on our side as far as British ships are concerned, and that, apart from motives of patriotism, there are also motives of self-interest. It is inconceivable to me that any owner of a ship would be so foolish as to put in command of it a man who would be in the least likely to hand it over to the enemy as a prize of war. For these reasons I confess I am not very much alarmed by the prospect which seems to concern the noble Lord so much.

Before sitting down, I ought, I think, to give two or three of the reasons which make it desirable that the present state of affairs should be continued, much as we must all deplore the presence of foreign officers on British ships. In the first place, in a trade like the timber trade, which is carried on with Norway and Sweden, there are many Norwegian and Swedish sailors employed, and it would be very hard on those men and would tend to drive that particular trade from our flag if we were to deny to them the opportunity of promotion in our own service. Then there is the trade carried on with Levantine ports, where it is extremely important, in the interests of the owners, that one officer at least of the ship should be able to speak the different dialects. We are, as a nation, very proud of ourselves as sailors, but I do not think we can claim that pride for our capacity as linguists; and that supplies a powerful reason for there being a small percentage of foreigners on vessels of that kind. On the other hand, a large number of British subjects are employed as officers on foreign ships, and one cannot but suppose that the first effect of an ordinance such as the noble Lord desires would be retaliation on the part of those countries, which might at once drive those men out of employment. For these reasons I hope the House will not agree to the Motion.

THE EARL OF MEATH: My Lords, I regret exceedingly that the Government are not able to give a more satisfactory reply to the noble Lord who has moved this Motion. I cannot help saying that I think his proposition an eminently reasonable one. I have listened with great interest to the objection raised by His Majesty's Government, but I cannot see that there is any force in it. Now, what is it that the noble Lord desires? He desires that British ships should not be commanded by foreigners. And why does he wish that? Not, as he has shown, from any selfish or from any trade-union principle. He desires it because he believes—and I agree with him—that there is a certain element of danger in time of war in permitting British ships to be officered by foreigners. That is conceded by the noble Lord who spoke on behalf of the Government; but he said that, as the danger was not great, it might be ignored. But why should we ignore it? If there is the slightest danger in the command of British ships by foreigners why should we ignore it? It will be difficult enough in time of war to convoy the supplies of food. It was found in the great Napoleonic wars a very difficult thing to do with the enormous preponderance possessed in those days. Much more so will it be the case now. Why, therefore, deliberately add an extra difficulty which it is not necessary should exist? We have never had any experience since the Napoleonic wars of naval warfare on a large scale, and we must remember that in those days, although there were large numbers of men enlisted in foreign armies and navies, there was no universal compulsory military service such as now exists on the Continent. The result is that at the present moment almost every foreigner has passed terms of service in the Army or Navy, and until a very advanced time of middle age he is under the power and influence of his Government. Therefore the position is different from what it was in former days. Each of the 472 alien captains and officers in the British mercantile marine has passed through the ranks of his navy or army. These men could be influenced, and would be influenced, by their respective Governments. As the noble Lord has pointed out, we are dependent upon the merchant service for our food supply, without which we should starve and be compelled to give in. I hope His Majesty's Government will take this matter into consideration. The objections raised by the noble Lord who spoke on behalf of the Government appear to me to be futile. First, we were told that there was the timber trade and that there were Norwegians who would be turned out of employment. I should be very sorry for them, but it is not our business to consider Norwegians. We have to consider the interests of our fellow-subjects and of this country. The next point was the Levantine trade. I have never heard a more futile objection than that our seamen cannot speak languages. Supposing we could not find a British seaman who could speak the particular language, would there be no Levantines who could act as interpreters? The third reason given by the noble Lord was that there were British subjects in foreign merchant services, and that those countries would retaliate and drive the Britishers back to these shores. I should be only too thankful if they did, because they would then have to enlist in the British Navy or in the British merchant service. We want them there, not in foreign services. I hope His Majesty's Government will reconsider their decision in this matter.

Lord MUSKERRY: My Lords, I am afraid there are not sufficient noble Lords remaining in the House to enable a division to be taken, even if I wished to press my Motion. I shall, therefore, by leave of the House, withdraw it. But I should like to say, with regard to the noble Lord's fear of retaliation on the part of foreign countries, that your Lordships may rest perfectly assured that the services of British officers in foreign ships will be dispensed with as soon as they can be replaced. I have seen that done over and over again; and if there are any Englishmen serving in foreign ships it is only because there are no subjects of that country qualified to take their place. The noble Lord said I had introduced five Bills in ten years to give effect to my views. I am afraid I shall have to bring in a sixth. I do not, however, press my Motion on the present occasion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at half-past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 24th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Bishop's Sutton, against; to lie upon the Table.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Petition from Hornsey, for legislation, to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Deptford, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 20th November, 1908, granting a Retired Allowance to Mr. William Stead, First Class Officer of Excise, Aberdeen Collection, under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Statement as to Expenditure by Local Education Authorities on the Maintenance (as distinct from administration and loan charges) of Public Elementary Schools for the year ended 31st March 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UGANDA.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to Famine in the Busoga District of Uganda [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS ACTS, 1877 AND 1907.

Copy presented, of Order dated 12th November, 1908, entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Prohibition of Importation of Bushes) Amendment Order of 1908" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (PRISONS).

Copy presented, of Rules and Regulations, dated 29th October, 1908, amending Regulations for Naval Prisons made by the Admiralty under the Naval Discipline Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

RIVERS POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT, 1876.

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary for Scotland by His Majesty's Inspector for Scotland under the Act [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INEBRIATES ACTS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report for Scotland under the Inebriates Acts for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Return ordered, "showing the amount of annual expenditure incurred for the upkeep of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, also the sum contributed by the taxpayers and by the Treasury, respectively, and giving particulars of the number of barracks and men, and cost of salaries and pay, during the past five years."—(*Mr. Field.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Persons found in Destitute Condition in Public Places.

Mr. TALBOT (Oxford University): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attenton has been called to the report of an inquest held last week in Westminster on the death of a man found in a dying condition on the Victoria Embankment as the result of which the jury returned a verdict of death from starvation; whether anything is known of the movements of the man before he was found by the police; and whether the police can be instructed to take all possible pains to remove persons found in a destitute condition in public places to the workhouse infirmaries or the hospitals so as to prevent the recurrence of such an occurrence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have seen a newspaper report of the inquest, held at Westminster on 13th November, on a man named Trew, which is, I believe, the one to which the right hon. Gentleman refers. The police had no knowledge of this man or his movements until he was found on the Embankment. They already have full instructions to deal with all such cases in a prompt and humane manner. Acting under these instructions, the constable who noticed the man on a seat on the Embankment, apparently ill, sent at once for an ambulance, and removed him to hospital, where he died shortly afterwards. The same action would be taken by the police in any other similar cases. I should add that the man was not absolutely destitute, as he had 4s. 2d. in his purse.

Indian Regiments Changing Stations by Road.

Captain FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if he will state what period has elapsed since British and Native regiments habitually marched by road from one station to another when changing stations; and if it is contemplated to revive the practice during peace time.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) Although the practice of marching British and Native regiments by road from station to station in peace time has become less common with the increase of railway communications, it is by no means infrequent at the present time. The occasions on which route marching is adopted are entirely in the discretion of the military authorities.

Distress Committee for Stoke-on-Trent.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received any request from the town council of Stoke-on-Trent to reconsider the recent refusal of his Department to sanction the establishment of a distress committee under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905; and what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Board informed the town council of Stoke-on-Trent on 28th October that, on the information then before them, they doubted whether they would be justified in establishing a distress committee for the borough. No further reply or information has been received from the town council; but I have instructed one of my inspectors to make some investigation.

Sanction for Loan for Electric Mains at Stoke-on-Trent.

Mr. JOHN WARD: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the town council for Stoke-on-Trent have made formal application to his Department for sanction to borrow £7,555 to extend electrical mains to the district of Fenton for the supply of power to manufacturers and others; whether the Local Government have considered the same and the damage to the trade of the district which will result from unnecessary delay in providing energy; and what action, if any, it is proposed to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The town council have made such an application. A local inquiry has been held, and the town council have been informed that any question of supply to Fenton should be deferred pending a settlement in regard to the question of the federation of the potteries towns. The inspector reported that no evidence was brought forward at the inquiry to show the immediate necessity for a supply of electrical energy in Fenton, and I am advised that it is doubtful whether the capital expenditure contemplated with that object would prove remunerative.

Burwell Farm, Cambridgeshire.

Mr. JOHN WARD: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Crown farm at Burwell, Cambridgeshire, has been let to a tenant since 1905; whether the tenant has farmed it or sub-let it to other tenants; if so, how many subtenants are there, and what is the size and rent of each small holding; and what is the financial result of this new arrangement to the tenants and the Crown.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Crown farm at Burwell was let to my hon. friend the Member for East Cambridgeshire as from Michaelmas, 1906, for the purpose of establishing small holdings and allotments. Full particulars of the letting and sub-letting are given in the First Report (1907) of the President of the Board on the Agricultural Crown Lands, a copy of which I will be pleased to send my hon. friend. As mentioned in that Report there was an actual loss of £690 17s. 3d., without allowing for rent or Crown Receivers' fees for superintendence, during the two years to Michaelmas 1906 while the farm was in hand, whereas by the letting a rental of £700 per annum was secured. The President has no official knowledge of the result of the arrangement to the sub-tenants, but my hon. friend the Member for East Cambridgeshire has been good enough to supply the following interesting particulars. The rent has been paid in full and to time. No small-holder has given up his holding. The amount of stock now on the holdings is two and-a-half times as much as it was in 1906. The small-holders have spent £750 on feeding stuffs and £600 on new implements during the past year, while the amount of outside labour paid for amounts to something over 24s. an acre.

Mr. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can say whether a tenant held the Crown farm at Burwell, Cambridgeshire, during 1904 and 1905; what amount of rent was paid by such tenant; if there was no tenant in possession, what arrangements were made for conducting the farm; and what was the profit or loss during that period.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) For the two years from Michaelmas, 1904, to Michaelmas, 1906, the Crown farm was in hand for want of a tenant. The farm was stocked by the Commissioner of Woods, and was cultivated and managed by a resident bailiff, under the superintendence of the Crown Receivers. Upon the farm being relet as from Michaelmas, 1906, the stock and crops were realised, and the total loss for the two years, without charging rent or Crown Receivers' fees for superintendence amounted to £690 17s. 3d.

Old-Age Pension Regulations—Opportunity for Discussion.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): To ask the Prime Minister when an opportunity will be afforded of discussing the Departmental Regulations *re* the Old-Age Pensions Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I am afraid that, unless some special reason for doing so is brought to my notice, it will be difficult to find another opportunity for the discussion of these Regulations.

Public Elementary Schools.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the President of the Board of Education what were the figures of school places in the council, Church of England, Roman Catholic, and other public elementary schools, respectively, of England and Wales during the school years 1901–2 and 1906–7; and what were the figures of children in average attendance in each of these classes of schools during the same years.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*)—

Public Elementary Schools.

(*a*) Recognised Accommodation.

	1901–2.	1906–7.
Council	3,003,247	3,650,503
Church of England	2,813,978	2,681,442
Roman Catholic	403,064	406,137
Other schools	506,560	306,125

(*b*) Average Attendance.

	1901–2.	1906–7.
Council	2,369,980	2,873,801
Church of England	1,927,663	1,899,965
Roman Catholic	269,191	286,188
Other schools	348,583	231,330

Education Bill—Regulations under Clause 2.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Education when will the Regulations proposed to be made under Clause 2, subsection (5), of the Education Bill be submitted to the House; and will the same condition apply under the Regulations to the desire of parents for their children to receive undenominational as will apply to denominational teaching.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Regulations will be laid upon the Table before the House enters upon the Committee stage of the Bill. Subsection (5) of Clause 2 applies only to requests on the part of parents for facilities for religious instruction of a character different from that which it is open to the local education authority to give in accordance with Section 14 (2) of the Elementary Education Act, 1870.

Unemployed Distress at Southwick-on-Wear.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that there is great distress in the urban district of

Southwick-on-Wear, Sunderland, owing to unemployment; and, if so, can he state why the Government, in view of the increased sum of money set apart for work for the unemployed, refuse to make a grant to such areas if the authorities of such areas are prepared to put in operation schemes of work for the relief of the unemployed.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am aware that there is a good deal of unemployment at Southwick-on-Wear. The grant at my disposal was voted for contributions in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, and hence I cannot allot payments from it to local authorities other than the authorities under that Act.

Board of Trade Examination Fees.

Sir G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is the practice for the Board of Trade to charge a fee of £1 to candidates presenting themselves for examination for first and second mates in the merchant service; whether, in the event of their failing, a further fee of £1 is charged for every subsequent examination; and, if so, whether he can see his way to make the first fee of £1 cover all subsequent examinations of the same candidate for the same grade.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The practice is as stated in the first part of the Question, except that the fee for examination or re-examination for a certificate as first mate is only 10s. when, as is usually the case, the candidate has already obtained a certificate as second mate. In view of the fact that the fees at present charged do not cover the examination expenses I do not see my way to meet the suggestion made by my hon. friend, which would have the effect of encouraging candidates to present themselves insufficiently prepared.

Appointment to Assistant Surveyorships of Taxes.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether at the examination held in September for assistant surveyorships of taxes the unprecedentedly small number of only six places was available for competition; was this caused by filling up nineteen places in the taxes department from candidates at the junior assistants examination held in July; was any notice given to intended candidates for the September examination that almost four-fifths of the vacancies for which they might fairly suppose they were competing were to be filled by the results of an examination for a quite different department; and would he recommend for taxes appointment, say, the first ten of the rejected in September.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The total number of six assistant surveyorships of taxes offered for competition at the examination held in September was below the average of previous years, owing to the number of retirements under the age limit having this year been unprecedentedly small. The number of vacancies was in no way due to the subsequent appointment of nineteen candidates from the junior assistants examination held in July, who were added to the establishment in view of an increase which was authorised by the Treasury as from 1st October, 1908, but which had not been sanctioned at the time when the September examination was announced. The candidates for the September examination were informed by advertisement and notice from the Civil Service Commissioners that not less than six vacancies would be open to competition, and this number was accordingly filled from the list. I cannot undertake to make any such recommendation as that suggested by the hon. Member in the last sentence of the Question.

Evicted Tenants—Case of Mrs. M'Cabe, of Ross.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what steps the Estates Commissioners have taken to reinstate Mrs. M'Cabe, of Ross, the evicted tenant on the Edward O'Connor estate, County Cavan; and when may she and her family expect to get the benefit of The Evicted Tenants Act, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that no application for reinstatement appears to have been lodged by Mrs. M'Cabe in respect of a holding on the O'Connor estate.

Appointment of Miss G. Knox to Ardess National School.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Miss Georgina Knox was in October, 1907, appointed assistant teacher at Ardess national school (Roll No. 11,717, District 3a); had Miss Knox passed the qualifying examination with King's scholarship; did the inspector of the national board several times inspect the school and report favourably on her educational work after her appointment; did she continue to discharge the duty till July, 1908; and on what ground was her appointment then declared invalid by the Board, and is she to receive any remuneration for her nine months' work.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that Miss Georgina Knox was appointed by the manager as assistant teacher in the Ardess national school in October, 1907. The Commissioners, on receiving a notification of the appointment in January, 1908, informed the manager that Miss Knox was ineligible, as she did not possess any of the qualifications prescribed by Rule 76 (*a*) and (*b*) of the Commissioners' Code. The fact that she had passed the qualifying examination for admission to a training college did not give her any claim to recognition as an assistant teacher. No special references were made by the inspector to Miss Knox's work. Notwithstanding the intimation that the appointment of Miss Knox could not be sanctioned, the manager retained her services up to the 30th June last. The Commissioners do not propose to make any payment to Miss Knox for the period during which she acted as teacher in this school.

Evicted Tenants—Case of Patrick Drum.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application on behalf of Patrick Drum, the son of the evicted tenant whose holding in Aughrim was evicted by John J. Benison in December, 1881; and is the landlord still in possession of this farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that Patrick Drum's application was not lodged within the time specified in the Evicted Tenants Act, and cannot therefore be dealt with under that Act. The Commissioners have not inquired into the case, and cannot say who is in possession of the farm in question.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Shipbuilding—Cost of Increased Speed.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Report of the Admiralty Committee on Mercantile Cruisers in 1902 calculated that a vessel of 23 knots ocean speed would cost £575,000 and that a vessel of only 2 knots greater speed, or 25 knots, would cost £1,000,000; and whether he can state, from any calculations in the possession of the Admiralty, what would have been the cost of three "Invincibles," designed for the same armament but of 23 knots speed, as compared with the three existing 25-knot "Invincibles" costing £4,931,000.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): There are no such calculations at present available.

New Torpedo Destroyers.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he is yet in a position to state if the orders for torpedo destroyers have yet been placed, and, if so, where; and whether the lowest tenders were accepted in each case.

MR. MCKENNA: The orders have been provisionally placed as follows: three to Messrs. Cammell, Laird and Company; three to Messrs. J. Brown and Company; three to the Fairfield Shipbuilding Company; one to the Thames Shipbuilding Company; two to Messrs. J. S. White and Company, Limited, Cowes; one to Messrs. Thornycroft and Company; one to Messrs. Denny Brothers; one to Messrs. Hawthorn, Leslie and Company, Limited, one to the London and Glasgow Shipbuilding Company, Limited. The acceptances are provisional, inasmuch as certain modifications in details of design and certain other contract conditions have to be agreed to. In allocating the orders, the lowest tenders were accepted so far as possible, consistent with such questions as suitability of design, experience of the firms, and proper distribution of orders.

Mr. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): Has any of the work been allocated to Irish firms?

Mr. McKENNA: I do not think any tendered, or, indeed, are capable of doing work of this kind.

Mr. GRETTON (Rutland): When are the vessels to be completed?

Mr. McKENNA: I think the contracts range from fifteen to eighteen months.

Manning of the Navy.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that both the officers and men of the Navy are so often moved from one warship to another that they seldom remain long enough on one ship to get accustomed to each other or their ship; whether he is aware that naval officers consider this system a great disadvantage both to men and officers; and whether, in view of the importance of the matter, he will consider the possibility of making different arrangements.

Mr. McKENNA: I am not aware that any representation has been made by naval officers that the officers and men are moved so often from one ship to another that they seldom remain long enough in one ship to get accustomed to one another or their ship, and I have no reason to suppose the circumstances to be such as are suggested in the hon. Member's Question.

Mr. HUNT: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire of the officers and men?

Mr. McKENNA: I have no opportunity. I get my information from the expert advisers of the Board who inform me no such representations have been made.

Mr. HUNT: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire among naval officers?

Mr. McKENNA: If opportunity serves I will do so, but I cannot undertake to do it.

*Mr. BELLAIRS inquired whether the right hon. Gentleman would have tabulated lists made of the number of times that ships changed their captains and their crews, and whether he was aware that the "Barfleur" changed her captain six times and her crew five times in the course of twenty-four months.

Mr. McKENNA: My hon. friend will not expect me, without express information, necessarily to accept the figures which he has given me. I will inquire into the matter further.

Territorial Force—7th Batt. Sherwood Foresters.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether permission has been given to the 7th Battalion Sherwood Foresters late Notts. Robin Hoods V.R.C., to retain their old Lincoln green uniforms, or whether the uniform of the battalion will be assimilated to that of the line regiment to which it is attached; and whether the badges, buttons, etc., on the service dress will be those of the Regular battalion, or whether a special pattern may be adopted.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Acland, Yorkshire, Richmond): This battalion is permitted, under the instructions issued in Circular Memorandum 49 to the County Associations, to retain as walking-out dress the distinctive uniform which it wore as a Volunteer battalion. Applications to introduce changes in the walking-out dress would be submitted by the County Association concerned, and in this case no such submission has been made. The service dress of the Territorial Force must for obvious military reasons correspond to that of the Regular Army. Applications to adopt special badges and buttons are dealt with on their merits.

MR. RICHARDSON: Will the battalion be allowed to retain the name of the Robin Hoods?

MR. ACLAND: That is a matter for the Association to make application about.

Murder of a Dacca Student.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is able to give any official information regarding the murder of a Dacca student by his fellow students and the cause of this occurrence.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, W.): According to the information received by the Secretary of State, the murdered student was the principal witness in respect of a charge of kidnapping brought against the head of a political association, of which he was an ex-member. It is thought that his connection with this charge supplied the motive for the crime.

Royal Indian Marine.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Secretary of State for India is aware of the dissatisfaction on the part of the first, second, and third-grade clerks of the Royal Indian Marine with their conditions of service, and of the fact that during the last ten years their petitions to the Government of India Marine Department and to the Viceroy praying for the provision of a compassionate family pension in the event of loss of life on duty, for an increase of pay, and a set of special leave and pension rules have been refused; that the request of the clerks for the provision of a compassionate family pension in the event of their meeting with death in the execution of duty was sent with the recommendation of the director of the Royal Indian Marine in November, 1901, to the Marine Department of the Government of India, which, however, refused to entertain it, although under the provisions of the Indian Marine Act of 1887 these clerks were made subject to the strict discipline, penalties, and risk of combatant service, and that while the pay of the gunners and carpenters in the Royal Indian Marine has recently been raised, the pay of the clerks has remained unchanged, while though in a combatant service they are deprived of the privileges of the Marine regulations, being governed by the Civil Service regulations in the particulars of leave and pension; and whether, having regard to the fact that these clerks are chiefly natives and Catholics from Goa and that the branches of the Indian Marine of similar rank, whose members are in enjoyment of greater privileges, are chiefly composed of Europeans and Protestants, the Secretary of State for India will consider the propriety of the appointment of a commission to inquire into the grievance of these clerks

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has no information on the subject; but he will make inquiry.

Reforms in India.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if he can state the date upon which the Secretary of State will explain the reforms contemplated for India; what opportunity this House will have of becoming acquainted with them; and when they will actually come into force.

SIR H. COTTON: At the same time may I ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, when the Secretary of State makes his statement regarding the reforms in India foreshadowed in His Majesty's gracious proclamation, a simultaneous statement will be made in this House; and whether this House will be afforded an opportunity for discussing the statement made.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I will answer this Question and that of the hon. Member for Nottingham on the same subject together. I am unable at present to add anything to the reply which I gave to the hon. Member for Nottingham on Thursday last.

*Mr. MACKARNESS: Does that mean that this House will be dependent for information on the debate in another place?

Mr. BUCHANAN: It merely means that I have nothing to add to the answer which I gave last Thursday.

Sir H. COTTON: Will this House be allowed no opportunity of discussing the question?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I have not said that.

*Mr. MACKARNESS: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when he will be in a position to state whether this House will have an opportunity of hearing the proposals of the Secretary of State?

Mr. BUCHANAN: No, Sir.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Are we to understand that we are only to get our information about India from the House of Lords?

Mr. BUCHANAN: No, Sir, you are not to understand that.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I am afraid I do understand it.

British Emigrants.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the names of those Colonies and Dependencies which insist upon an emigrant from Great Britain having in his possession a certain minimum sum in cash; and what are the respective minimum amounts in each case.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby): Immigrants into Canada landing before 1st January, 1909, are required to be in possession of at least 25 dollars; immigrants landing between 1st January and 15th February, 1909, must be in possession of at least 50 dollars, immigrants landing after the latter date must be in possession of 25 dollars. Immigrants into the Cape of Good Hope must be in possession of £20. Immigrants into the Transvaal must have a similar sum or a promise in writing from some employer of repute of immediate employment on arrival. In the case of the East African Protectorate an immigrant must satisfy the authorities that he has visible means of support, or he may be required to deposit £50.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Can the hon. Gentleman say whether any colony other than Canada compulsorily expropriates immigrants who have been in the Colony nearly two years because they are out of employment?

Colonel SEELY: I do not think that arises out of the Question.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) asked whether there was any difference in the sum required in the case of a British subject and an immigrant of any other nationality.

Colonel SEELY asked for notice of the Question.

Mr. ESSEX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state which Colonies or Dependencies, if any, forbid the entry of British emigrants who are under contracts of service to employers in such Colonies and Dependencies.

Colonel SEELY: The entrance of immigrants under a contract to perform manual labour into Autralia is forbidden unless the contract has been approved by the Minister for External Affairs. The circumstances in which such approval must be given, and the penalty imposed on an immigrant landing before approval has been given are laid down in the Commonwealth Act, No. 19, of 1905, the text of which is printed on pages 52 and 53 of the "Emigration Statutes and General Handbook," issued by the Emigrants' Information Office.

California (Trinidad) Water Rate.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether a memorial has been received signed by 104 proprietors, residing at California village, in the ward of Savonetta, Couva, Trinidad, protesting against the action of the Colonial Government in imposing water rates and enforcing the payment of the same upon a section of the taxpayers of the town of Couva and the village of California without giving them, as an equivalent for such payment, any water; and, if so, can he state what action has been taken in the matter.

Colonel SEELY: No, Sir; the Memorial has not been received at the Colonial Office.

Trinidad Indentured Immigrants.

Mr. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that nearly all sugar and several cocoa estates in Trinidad keep a special book with the object of evading the clause of the Immigration Ordinance which refuses additional immigrants when 70 per cent. of the adult males indentured have failed to earn 3s. 6d. a week; whether these special books show indentured immigrants as earning considerably more than they really do; whether the inspector of immigrants and his assistants are aware of the existence of these books; and, if so, can he state what action, if any, the Government intend to take to see that the conditions laid down by the Immigration Ordinance are complied with.

Colonel SEELY: The section of the Trinidad Ordinance to which my hon. friend refers (Section 70) requires that if 30 per cent. of the adult male immigrants have, during the year, earned a less amount of wages than will give an average for each of sixpence for every day during the twelve months, it shall not be lawful for the protector to accept any applications for immigrants in respect of the plantation in question for the year next ensuing, subject to the power of the Governor to give relief for due cause shown. The Secretary of State is unaware that any such special books are kept as my hon. friend indicates, but he will make inquiry on the subject if my hon. friend so desires.

Mr. SUMMERBELL: Will the hon. Gentleman let me know the result of the investigation?

Colonel SEELY: If my hon. friend desires, I will inquire and communicate with him.

Alleged Flogging of Zulus.

Mr. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have any information respecting the progress of the investigation which, on 18th September last, Sir M. Nathan reported to be then proceeding into the allegations that had been made by Miss Colenso as to the flogging of Zulus; and has the attention of the Secretary of State been called to the letters which were addressed by her to the Natal officials on this subject, dated 3rd September, 3rd, 5th, and 20th ultimo, in the last of which she represents its urgency to the Attorney-General of Natal, on the ground that the recent thrashings and threatenings of Zulus under martial law have a vital bearing on much of the alleged evidence against Dinizulu.

Colonel SEELY: I regret that the reply to our telegraphic inquiry has not yet been received.

Dinizulu.

Mr. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state upon what charges Dinizulu has been indicted; and whether any of the charges for which he was arrested and upon which he was committed for trial have not been proceeded with; and, if so, which they are.

Colonel SEELY: A copy of the indictment has now been received. It contains twenty-three counts charging the prisoner with various treasonable offences, but not with murder. I will lay it with other Papers at once.

MR. MACKARNESS: Are there no charges beside those of high treason?

COLONEL SEELY: The hon. Member had better wait until I lay the document, as a lengthy answer is involved.

MR. MACKARNESS: When will it be laid?

COLONEL SEELY: I have said at once.

Expedition against the Nigerian Munshis.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can inform the House whether any sanction has been given by the Secretary of State to a suggested military expedition against the Munshis in Nigeria, or whether the policy previously accepted by the Colonial Office on the advice of the chief authorities of Southern and Northern Nigeria is to continue.

COLONEL SEELY: No military expedition against the Munshis has been suggested or sanctioned. In accordance with settled policy steps are being taken to extend the area of our effective control with a view to ensuring the peace and good government of the country; but there has been no change in policy nor is any in contemplation.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked whether the expedition would receive military support.

COLONEL SEELY: Certainly. In accordance with what has been done we endeavoured to extend our effective control to prevent internecine warfare, but there is no fresh policy. Of course, if force is used against the expedition, force must be used in reply, but special instructions have been given to avoid the use of force by every possible means.

Russia and Persia—Colonel Liakhoff's Position.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Colonel Liakhoff, who led the Cossacks in the destruction of the Parliament buildings, has just been exhorting his Cossacks to destroy the constitution and win the loot of Tabris; and whether in view of the fact that the honour of Great Britain is involved by reason of the Anglo-Russian Convention, he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I do not follow the argument of the last part of the Question; and I cannot see that any obligation rests upon us in consequence of the Convention to interfere in the internal affairs of Persia. But, in any case, as I have received no information which leads me to think that there is any probability of Colonel Liakhoff's having made any such statement, and as I do not credit the report of it, it does not seem necessary for any one to take any steps.

DR. RUTHERFORD asked whether in view of the fact that Colonel Liakhoff destroyed the Parliamentary buildings his retention of the position of adviser to the Shah was consistent with the dignity of the latter.

SIR EDWARD GREY: For whatever action Colonel Laikhoff took in the summer responsibility rests between him and the Shah. I do not see that any responsibility rests upon any outside Power.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): Is it not a fact that Colonel Liakhoff is an officer in the active service of Russi

SIR EDWARD GREY: The hon. Member has asked that Question very often before.

MR. LYNCH: No, no.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Yes, the hon. Member asked it in the summer. Colonel Liakhoff is under the orders of the Shah and not of the Russian Government.

North German Essen Railway.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if any information has now been obtained as to whether the main line from Essen to the North and West Coasts of Germany had for some time past been reserved, exclusively, for the carriage of Government goods, chiefly armaments, so that ordinary trade was sent by a longer route; and, if so, is this rule still in force.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I can learn of no foundation whatever for the rumour alluded to by the hon. Member.

MR. BELLAIRS: Is my right hon. friend aware that articles have appeared in the German papers and complaints have been made by German manufacturers on account of this monopoly of the line?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not seen those articles. I understood from the Question on the Paper that what my hon. friend wanted was that I should make independent inquiries to ascertain whether the statement was true. I have made such inquiries, and I cannot obtain any information to show that it is true.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews, Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman make further inquiries?

[No Answer was returned.]

Egyptian Provincial Councils.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the draft law amending the constitution of provincial councils in Egypt and enlarging their powers has yet reached the final shape in which it is proposed that it shall be submitted to the Egyptian Legislative Council, in accordance with hopes held out by the British Agent in Cairo on page 4 of his Report for 1907 (Egypt, No. 1, 1908); and whether it is still intended that this step shall be taken in the course of the current year.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The draft decree mentioned by the hon. Member was duly passed by the Council of Ministers, and has already been submitted to the Legislative Council.

The Persian Parliament.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the House any information as to the convocation of the Persian Parliament or as to the nature of the assembly which the Shah proposes to set up.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am informed that the Shah has issued a rescript declaring that he does not intend to convoke a Medjliss at all. I can only repeat that this is entirely contrary to the advice which has been given by both the British and Russian Governments in the interest of the maintenance of order in Persia. It is, therefore, a step for the consequences of which the responsibility must rest entirely upon the Shah.

MR. HART-DAVIES: Have any representations been made to the Shah as to his responsibility?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I stated in reply to the previous Question that advice has been given.

Russia and Persian Territory.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Russian Government have recently issued a declaration to the effect that Russia will in no circumstances occupy the slightest portion of Persian territory, and that no Russian troops will cross the frontier unless, with England's approval, it may be found indispensable to send a small detachment to protect the lives and properties of foreigners; and what was the form of this declaration.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware that any such declaration has been issued, nor do I think it could be expected in the form put in the Question.

International Naval Conference.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for

Foreign Affairs, in view of the approaching deliberations of an International Naval Conference on the laws of maritime warfare between representatives of this country and those of ten mainly military Powers, whether he can assure the House that this country shall not be committed to the acceptance of any alteration, modification, or new interpretation of any part of those laws except with the consent of Parliament.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot give any pledge except that any conclusions come to by the Conference on points of International Law will be laid before Parliament before it is asked to pass the legislation which will be necessary, as I understand, to enable His Majesty's Government to ratify the Prize Court Convention.

MR. BOWLES: Does the right hon. Gentleman wish the House to understand that, in certain conceivable circumstances, this country may find itself committed to a reduction of its maritime power without the knowledge or consent of Parliament?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Of course all responsibility for executive action which does not require legislation rests with the Government.

MR. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the nine Powers which have accepted the invitation of His Majesty's Government to take part in the International Naval Conference, meeting in London on 1st December, are the only Powers to which such an invitation has been addressed; and, if not, can he say what other Powers were invited, and with what results in each case.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative.

International Trade—Professor Marshall's Pamphlet.

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Paper on International Trade, by Professor Marshall, just published as a Parliamentary Paper, was written at the request of the Treasury in 1903; and, if so, whether he will invite an economist who is opposed to the system of free imports to write a Memorandum on the same subject, so that this country may have the opportunity, with the sanction and at the expense of the Government, of studying a scientific examination of the question from both sides.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): As regards the first part of the Question, I think I cannot do better than refer the hon. Member to the letter from Mr. Marshall which appeared in *The Times* of yesterday, in which Mr. Marshall explained the origin of the Memorandum and the causes which led to its publication. The Memorandum was prepared for the late Government and was only issued owing to the request of the hon. Member, and I think it would be establishing an undesirable precedent if, by inviting another economist to furnish a rejoinder, I were to initiate a controversy at the public expense.

MR. BONAR LAW: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the point in regard to which I challenged him is not even referred to in Professor Marshall's Memorandum?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I do not think that is so. I only referred to the document to quote from it, and I was bound by the Rules of the House, if requested to do so, to lay it on the Table and publish it.

MR. BONAR LAW: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I made no demand for the document? The right hon. Gentleman made a statement on the subject.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not entitled to make a speech.

MR. BONAR LAW: May I put it in this way? If I can convince the right hon. Gentleman——[Cries of "Order!"]

*MR. SPEAKER: That is commencing a hypothetical question.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman with reference to that part of his Answer which says that the Paper was prepared at the request of the late Government, whether he is not aware that it was prepared for an individual Member of the late Government, and was not circulated to the late Government, and was not left on record at the Treasury by the Minister for whom it was prepared.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is certainly not my information, and if the Members of the bench opposite want the whole of the record of the transaction I can easily publish it, but I can only do that on their responsibility.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: My information is that it is not a record of the late Ministry, and was not circulated to members of the late Government. It was not left on record.

Pension Officers.

Mr. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the sections of the Old-Age Pensions Act under which power has been taken to appoint two classes of pension officers for each pension district; whether he is aware that throughout the entire Act the reference is to the pension officer, and not to the pension officers, for each district, and that the same language is not repeated in the definition clause of the Treasury Regulations; and whether, in view of the fact that this duplication of officials must involve expense and delay that might have been avoided, he will take counsel's opinion as to its legality.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Pension officers are appointed by the Treasury under Section 8 (4), which provides that the Treasury may appoint such number of these officers as they think fit to act for such areas as they direct. "Pension officer" is defined in the Regulations to mean the pension officer to whom any claim or question is referred. I see no reason to doubt the legality of these arrangements, nor does it seem to me that any other scheme would prove more economical.

Pension Applicants' Characters.

Mr. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that papers are being issued to tradesmen in the South of London from the pension officer of the Inland Revenue Office asking for information concerning the characters of applicants for old-age pensions, and as to whether they always worked according to their ability to support those dependent upon them; is there anything in the instructions to justify such inquiries; and will he see that pension officers are prevented in future from bringing discredit on the Old-Age Pensions Act.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: It is the statutory duty of the pension officer to satisfy himself that a claimant is not subject to disqualification under Section 3 (1) (*b*) of the Act, and, under Nos. 5 and 6 of the Instructions to pension officers as to investigation of claims, which form the Second Schedule of the Regulations, he is authorised to reduce to writing any question which he desires to put to any person, and is required to take all reasonable steps to obtain the best evidence and information which it is reasonably possible to obtain and to make all such inquiries as appear to him necessary having regard to the circumstances of the case.

Mr. BARNES: Does this instruction apply to women applicants for pensions as to character?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: It would certainly apply to all applicants for pensions.

Mr. BARNES: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that pension officers are inquiring as to the character of applicants for pensions, notwithstanding that such applicants have been members of friendly societies for, in some cases, fifty years; and will he take steps to see that such officers be instructed to keep within the limits of the provisions of the Old-Age Pensions Act.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have received no complaints as to the way in which pension officers are discharging their duties in the matter. If the hon. Member has a specific case in mind, I shall be happy to have it looked into if he will give me the particulars.

Pension Regulations.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will arrange for the translation of the Regulations with regard to old-age pensions into the Welsh language.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Both the Act and the Regulations have been translated into Welsh and are being printed by the Stationery Office. They will be published in a few days.

MR. KETTLE: Will the same course be taken with regard to Irish speaking districts in Ireland?

MR. WATT: And in Scotland also?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have had no application from either Scotland or Ireland. It has not been represented to me as an Irish grievance.

Dinorwic Quarries.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what was the number of men employed at the Dinorwic quarries, in the county of Carnarvon, for the year ending 31st December, 1907; how many were employed inside and outside the quarry, respectively; and what was the number of accidents reported during the same period, distinguishing those to men employed inside and outside the quarry.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The figures asked for are as follows: Employed inside, 1,114; employed outside, 1,711; total employed, 2,825. Fatal accidents reported, 4, all of which occurred to inside workers. Non-fatal accidents reported, 38, of which 32 occurred to inside workers.

Stray Dogs in London.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether last year the Metropolitan Police handed over to the veterinary inspectors 12,018 dogs; what orders these veterinary inspectors have as to the disposal of these dogs, and by whose authority the orders are issued; and what precautions are taken to prevent these dogs being used for purposes of vivisection.

MR. GLADSTONE: The number stated is correct. Detailed instructions to persons taking charge of dogs under the Act of 1906 are issued under the authority of the Commissioner of Police, and are in strict compliance with the Act. Every veterinary surgeon when appointed is required to give a formal undertaking that he will not sell or hand over any dog for the purpose of vivisection.

MR. SMEATON: Is there any statutory penalty for infringement of this regulation?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not sure.

Explosions of Inflammable Liquids.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can give the number of deaths and injuries and the amount of damage done to property during the past three years owing to the bursting or exploding of vessels containing inflammable liquids; whether the Government is aware that there are mechanical devices compulsory by law in several countries in Europe which secure complete immunity from such explosions; and whether, in view of the increase in the use of petrol or other inflammable liquids, the Government are willing to amend the Petroleum Act of 1903 to make the use of safety devices compulsory in this country.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have no official information as to the number and nature of such accidents, though I have reason to believe that the number of deaths at any rate is extremely small, nor have I any information as to the legal requirement of safety devices in foreign countries. I have had in view for some time the appointment of a small committee to consider what steps can be taken to diminish the dangers attendant on the storage and conveyance of petrol. This committee, as I stated yesterday, would consider, *inter alia*, the use of improved mechanical devices.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): Are there no figures as to accidents supplied by reliable authorities?

MR. GLADSTONE: I will inquire.

MR. P. BARLOW (Bedford): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the last three months there have been thirteen deaths and sixteen cases of personal injury?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not aware of it.

Royal Procession at Oxford Circus.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that on the occasion of the passage down Oxford Street of the Royal procession on the 18th instant, the arrangements made by the police at Oxford Circus for crossing that thoroughfare were so defective that persons were obliged, with the consent of the police but without their assistance, to push themselves across as best they could; and will he arrange that in future on such occasions passages shall be arranged at convenient intervals for persons on foot and shall be kept open by the police.

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir. I have received no complaints on the subject, and the Commissioner of Police informs me that the arrangements made were as effective as possible. It is obvious that on such occasions some inconvenience must be caused both to vehicular traffic and pedestrians, which no police arrangements can prevent.

Treatment of Young Persons.

SIR GEORGE KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will take into consideration the establishment in connection with the Home Office of a consultative committee, similar to the consultative committee at the Board of Education, to which matters relating to children and young persons may be referred by him; and whether such a committee can be established without legislation.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have considered my hon. friend's suggestion, but I do not see my way to adopting it. I am always able, without the formal constitution of a Standing Committee, to obtain the friendly advice and assistance of those best qualified to advise on any question relating to children and young persons that may from time to time arise—and in the case of any question of unusual difficulty or complexity, it is always open to me to appoint, *ad hoc*, a committee of specially qualified persons.

Bradford Goods Guards, Hours of Duty.

MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that among the goods guards employed by the Midland Railway Company at Bradford there occurred, from 10th September last to 8th October last, sixty-four cases of men working periods varying from sixty to sixty-five hours per week to eighty-five to ninety hours per week, and that on 15th September last three local goods guards were dismissed; and will he say what action he has taken, or proposes to take, under the Railways Regulation Act, 1893, to deal with these cases.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): In connection with the dismissal of certain goods guards on the Midland Railway my attention was drawn by my hon. friend the Member for Derby to the overtime worked by other goods guards at various places on the railway in September. On inquiry I ascertained that the whole matter was under consideration by the Conciliation Boards, established under the agreement of last November, I am glad to learn that on the 6th instant the Central Conciliation Board on the Midland Railway came to a settlement upon all outstanding questions relating to goods guards, and in view of this settlement no further action on the part of the Board of Trade would seem to be necessary.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): Cannot the right hon. Gentleman get further information regarding the excessive hours of duty?

Mr. CHURCHILL said the matter had been discussed fully, and a satisfactory settlement arrived at, and he had not, therefore, thought it necessary to go into special details.

Imports of Slates.

Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what percentage of the total amount of slates used in this country has been imported from abroad in each of the years 1902 to 1907, inclusive.

Mr. CHURCHILL: If the annual consumption of slates in the United Kingdom be taken as equivalent to the production of each year with the imports added and the exports deducted, it appears that the proportion of imported slates to the total consumption so ascertained, was about 13 per cent. in 1902, 19 per cent. in 1903, 14 per cent. in 1904, 12 per cent. in 1905, and 8 per cent. in both 1906 and 1907. In making this calculation, account has been taken of the imports and exports of roofing slates only, no separate information being available with regard to any imports or exports of slate in other forms.

Mr. TOMKINSON asked if the marked increase in imports was not in the period of the Penrhyn strike.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): Lock-out.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That probably is the case.

Mr. BONAR LAW: Will the right hon. Gentleman apply the principle he has adopted in the case of slates to other classes of goods?

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is rather a complicated question, which I should like to study.

Mr. ELLIS DAVIES: What proportion of the slates was exported to British Colonies?

Mr. CHURCHILL asked for notice.

Hammersmith Bridge Embankment.

Mr. CLYNES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in reference to the number of deaths from accidental drowning on the Surrey side of Hammersmith Bridge, he is aware that the Borough of Hammersmith and the Urban Council of Barnes have each offered to pay one-third of the cost of erecting a protective wall or railing to make the embankment safe; and whether, in view of the refusal of the Thames Conservancy to spend any money for this purpose, he can take any action to procure the consent of the Conservancy and the early undertaking of necessary protective works.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am informed by the Thames Conservancy Board that they have received and carefully considered a proposal made to them by the Barnes Urban District Council that a fence should be erected at the place referred to, the cost being defrayed in equal shares by the Council, the Corporation of Hammersmith, and the Thames Conservancy Board. This proposal the Conservancy Board have felt themselves unable to accede to, as the execution of protective works on the river banks is not, in their opinion, a duty with which they are charged, though they are ready, as I informed the hon. Member on 15th July last, to give the local authority permission to construct protective works provided these do not interfere with the use of the towpath or navigation. The matter does not appear to be one in regard to which the Board of Trade possess any powers.

Electric Lighting Companies Accounts.

Mr. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, having regard to his promise carefully to watch the operation of the Board of Trade arrangements for the audit of the accounts of electric lighting companies, he has arrived at the conclusion that it is undesirable in the public interests that the same auditors shall continue to act in the dual capacity of Board of Trade and shareholders' auditors; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that the Board of Trade's own Return showed that this practice was pursued in no less than forty-nine cases, he will consider the desirability of ending it in the new appointments that are about to be made.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir. I do not intend to appoint any of the shareholders' auditors to act as official auditors of the accounts of the same electric lighting companies for the present year.

Welsh Trade Statistics.

MR. WALTER ROCH (Pembroke): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can in future in the Board of Trade statistics publish the statistics for Wales separately.

MR. CHURCHILL: I will consider how far it may be possible to meet the views of my hon. friend, and will communicate with him further on the subject.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): Will goods sent from Wales into England be treated as exports?

[No Answer was returned.]

Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief Disqualification.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is yet in a position to say whether an old-age pension may be given to a woman who is fully qualified to receive a pension but whose husband is in receipt of outdoor Poor Law relief.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): If the relief were given to the husband solely for his own support, the wife would not, I think, be thereby disqualified.

Distress in the Cockermouth Union.

SIR JOHN RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether there has been any grant for the relief of distress at Workington or Maryport following applications from these districts; is there any possibility of his taking steps to prevent persons who have accepted test work at the stoneyard from the Cockermouth Board of Guardians under special, temporary, and exceptional circumstances due to unemployment being disfranchised; and whether his attention has been called to the fact that the special committee on distress due to unemployment in 1895, of which he was a member, recommended that persons so relieved should not be disfranchised.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. There is no distress committee for either of the places mentioned, so that no payment could be made to them from the grant at the present time. I have, however, given consideration to the circumstances of both places, have made inquiries with regard to them, and I am now in communication with the local authorities as respects the distress in them. Legislation would be necessary to give effect to the suggestion in the second part of the Question. I am aware of the Report of the Committee of 1895, but I am afraid I could not hold out any promise of legislation on the subject at the present time.

Lancashire Technical School.—Work for the Unemployed.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS (Manchester, N.W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that technical and secondary schools at Earlston, Eccles, Middleton, Morecombe, Lancaster, Waterford, Waterloo-with-Seaforth, and Walkden have been approved by the local education authority for the County of Lancaster at various dates between October, 1906, and May, 1908; whether he is aware that the cost of building these schools with the extensions will amount to upwards of £167,000 but that progress cannot be made until the sanction of the Local Government Board is obtained; and if, in view of the prevailing unemployment in Lancashire and in the interest of education, he can expedite the departmental sanction.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am aware of the facts in this matter. The limitation on the amount which the town or urban district councils can raise for purposes of secondary education prevents their being able to borrow the sums required without some assistance from the county council, and considerable difficulties have arisen in connection with the arrangements to be made for this purpose between the county council and the other councils. I have long been in correspondence with the county council with regard to the matter. I am about to address a further communication to them on the subject, and I trust that this will effect a settlement of the difficulties to which I have referred. I will then at once deal with the applications for sanction to the borrowing of the sums required.

In reply to a further Question by Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley),

MR. JOHN BURNS said they were rapidly approaching a settlement of this rather tangled question.

Treatment of Remand Prisoners.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the case of a girl who, having been charged at the Marylebone Police Court with a petty offence was sent to a remand home, where, after being detained for a week, and on the day preceding her liberation by the magistrate under the Probation of Offenders Act, she was taken downstairs by a woman at the Home, who cropped off the girl's hair close to her head; what and where is this Home; what is the name of the woman who committed the assault; and what does he propose to do in the matter.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have made inquiry as to this case. It occurred at the Pentonville Road Remand Home, established by the Metropolitan Asylums Board. It appears that the girl's hair was cut off by the house mother of the girls branch of the Home by direction of the visiting medical officer on account of its verminous condition. The medical officer explains that he gave the direction as he had been informed that the girl was to go to an Industrial Home. Had he known that this was not correct, he would not have given the order for the hair to be removed. In the circumstances it does not seem to me necessary that I should take any further action in the matter.

MR. PICKERSGILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman make representations to the authorities of the Home, and specially to the medical officer, that in future no girl's hair shall be cut unless the magistrate has actually made an order?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will bear the suggestion in mind. Everything that can be done to avoid a repetition of this Rape of the Lock will be done.

Special Committees for Unemployment

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the fact that the Unemployed Workmen Act, by Section 2 (3), peremptorily required all county councils and county borough councils, wherever no distress committee was established, to appoint special committees to obtain information as to the conditions of employment, and to promote or establish labour exchanges, he will state in what counties and county boroughs such special committees have been established; whether the Local Government Board has ever called the attention of county and county borough councils to their obligations under this subsection; and whether he will present a Return giving a summary of the statistical and other information obtained by the special committees thus constituted, and by any labour exchanges which they have promoted.

MR. JOHN BURNS: Shortly after the passing of the Act the Local Government Board called the attention of these councils to the requirements of subsection (3) of Section 2, and they subsequently communicated with them with special reference to labour exchanges and employment registers. Returns have not been received as to these cases. I regret, therefore, that I am not in a position to give my hon. friend the particulars for which he asks.

MR. ALDEN: When is it likely we shall have the information?

MR. JOHN BURNS: If I can bring any pressure to bear on the county councils to hurry it on I will do so.

Customs and the Coastguard.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state whether, when the coastguard service is transferred to the Customs, men in the former service will be promoted to higher positions in the Customs waterguard without the usual examination in force for such promotions; and whether he will consider the possibility of recruiting the positions in the upper and lower sections of preventive officers from the existing waterguard staff, with a view to somewhat relieving the existing stagnation of promotion among both the preventive officers and preventive men grades.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): A Bill will be necessary to give effect to any amalgamation, and under these circumstances I would prefer not to make any definite statement on the subject.

Stationery for Government Offices.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has decided that only ink made in Ireland shall be used in Irish Government Departments; and whether he could arrange that the blotting-paper used for all Government work should all be of either British or Irish manufacture

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): Will the hon. Gentleman arrange that goose quills shall be substituted for steel pens throughout the service in order to encourage small holders to keep geese?

MR. HOBHOUSE: I am informed that only ink made in Ireland is used in Irish Government Departments. The blotting-paper used for all Government work is made in the United Kingdom.

Small Holdings.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in order to expedite the acquisition of land under the Small Holdings Act, the Board will be prepared to specify some reasonable period of time at the expiry of which it will expect the requirements of all suitable applicants, whose applications were made immediately after the passing of the Act, to have been satisfied.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somerset, S.): The suggestion will be borne in mind, but the Board do not think the time has yet come to carry it out.

MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that at a recent conference of the county councils Lord Carrington described it as a most admirable suggestion?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I am not aware of that.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): Is the hon. Member aware that under Section 3 of the Act if the Commissioners and the Board of Agriculture were fully to carry out their duties it would be impossible for a county council to delay carrying out a scheme for more than six months?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

MR. ROGERS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that inquiries held under the Small Holdings Act have revealed the existence of a large demand for land in places where such demand cannot be satisfied locally owing to the prevalent system of cultivation being already one of small holdings, more particularly in parts of Wales, Lancashire, and Somerset; and whether the Board will consider the desirability of so amending the Act as to give to a central authority power to create opportunities of land holding for persons who are willing to move out of their own districts.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are aware that there are difficulties in acquiring land in those parts of the country where a large number of small holdings already exist, but no amendment of the Act is necessary to enable county councils to provide holdings for applicants who are prepared to move outside their own county.

Organisation of Agricultural Enterprise.

Mr. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board would urge upon the various county councils the importance of appointing in each county an expert lecturer and organiser for the purpose of establishing co-operation and other methods of agricultural enterprise amongst small holders; and whether the Board of Agriculture could see its way to render financial assistance towards this object from the funds at his disposal.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board fully recognise the importance of this matter and are considering the whole question as to the best means to be adopted to encourage co-operation among small holders, and the suggestion of the hon. Member will not be lost sight of.

Counties without Small Holding Schemes.

Mr. ROBERT HARCOURT (Montrose, Burghs): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what counties in England and Wales have neither acquired land nor submitted schemes under the Small Holdings Act.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: The counties which have neither acquired land nor submitted schemes are:—England: Cumberland, Derby, Hereford. Lancashire. London, Middlesex, Monmouth, Suffolk West, Surrey, Sussex East, Sussex West, Warwick, York (North Riding). Wales: Brecon, Cardigan, Carnarvon, Flint, Glamorgan, Merioneth, Pembroke. I should add, however, that many of them are in active negotiation for the acquisition of land.

Small Holdings Act—Defaulting Counties.

Mr. ROBERT HARCOURT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in the opinion of the Board, any county councils have failed to make adequate use of their powers under the Small Holdings Act; and, if so, whether it is proposed to take steps to declare them in default.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: Every county council has practically completed its preliminary inquiries, and is now in active negotiation for land. Whenever desirable the Board make strong representations in favour of greater expedition and energy, and they will not fail to take any further action that may prove necessary.

Mr. MORRELL: Has any county council yet forwarded a Report to the Commissioners to the effect that it is desirable to proceed?

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: Whenever the Board thinks that a county council is not taking sufficiently active steps Commissioners are sent down.

Small Holdings in Hampshire.

Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many applications for small holdings have been made; how much land has been applied for; and how many small holdings have been created up to date in each division of Hampshire; whether any scheme of small holdings in Hampshire has yet been reported to or approved by the Board of Agriculture; will he state the names of the members of the committee or committees (if any such have been constituted) charged with the administration of the Act in each division of the county; and whether any of the Commissioners have yet visited any of the divisions of Hampshire; and, if so, what Report have they made to the Board as to the way in which the Act is being administered.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: Five hundred and thirteen applications have been made for 7,579 acres, but no small holdings have been actually provided as yet. The Board have received and approved one scheme. Six visits to the county have been made by the Commissioners and inspectors, and they are satisfied that the county council are doing their best to administer the Act. I shall be pleased to send my hon. friend a list giving the names of the small Holdings Committee.

MR. SMEATON: Is it not the fact that up to the present time only 15 acres have been actually distributed?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: That is so, but I hope more land will soon be distributed.

MR. MORRELL: And although 513 persons have been waitng for eleven months, has no Report been made that it is desirable to prepare a scheme?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: We are satisfied that up till now the county council has done its utmost; otherwise we should take steps.

MR. MORRELL: Is it not the duty of the Commissioners as soon as they are aware there is a demand for land to report that fact?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is arguing the matter rather than seeking information.

Suggested Increase of Inspectorate.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the number of applications which have been received under the Small Holdings Act and the number of those still waiting to be dealt with, the Board will now appoint another Commissioner and as many more inspectors as may be necessary in order to insure a more rapid and vigorous administration of the Act.

SIR E. STRACHEY: he Board are now considering what additional staff is necessary to cope with the work arising under the Act.

MR. MORRELL: Is it not the fact that, as now constituted, the Commissioners are really unable to carry out the work imposed on them by the Act?

SIR E. STRACHEY: I do not think so at the present moment. My hon. friend may rely on it that the President of the Board, if he thinks more staff is required, will not fail to make the necessary appointments.

*MR. MACKARNESS: How many inspectors are there now?

SIR E. STRACHEY: Six.

Small Holdings in Oxfordshire and Staffordshire.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will obtain from the Oxfordshire County Council full particulars of all approved applications under the Small Holdings Act according to the parishes in which the applicants live, showing name, address, and occupation of applicant, date of application, amount of land applied for, date at which the application was approved, and subsequent proceedings; and also particulars of all rejected applications with the reasons for the rejection in each case.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): At the same time may I ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will obtain from the Staffordshire County Council particulars of all applications approved by them according to the parishes in which the applicants live, showing name, address, and occupation of applicant, date of application, amount of land applied for, date at which application was approved, and subsequent proceedings; and also particulars of all rejected applications, with the reasons for the rejection in each case.

SIR E. STRACHEY: The Board are not prepared to ask for the Returns suggested. They would involve a great deal of labour without any corresponding advantage. Every applicant is informed whether he is approved or not, and the Board are always ready to inquire into any specific complaints. Our experience affords no justification for the suggestion that applicants are, as a rule, rejected on inadequate grounds.

Mr. BENNETT: Can the hon. Gentleman say how it is that some of the applicants in Oxfordshire whose applications have been either ignored or not approved have not been notified of the fact?

*Mr. MACKARNESS: And is the hon. Gentleman aware that in Berkshire applications are refused without reasons being given to the applicants?

Sir E. STRACHEY: If that is so the applicants should complain to the county council.

Mr. MORRELL: Is it not the duty of the Commissioners to ascertain the extent of the demand? Do they do that?

*Sir E. STRACHEY: They do it through the county council, and the Board do not interfere so long as they think the county council are acting in a proper manner.

Small Holdings—Suggested Appointment of Local Inspectors.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the number of applications received from certain districts and the delay which has already occurred, the Board will consider the advisability of appointing local inspectors in all such districts to assist the Commissioners and the county councils in ascertaining and satisfying the demand.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are now considering what additional staff is necessary to cope with the work arising under the Act.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS: When are the Board likely to come to a definite conclusion?

*Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: After due consideration.

Small Holdings.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether any case has yet occurred in which the Commissioners have reported to the Board that it is desirable that a scheme should be made and the Board have forwarded that report to the county council, as provided in Section 3 of the Small Holdings Act, so as to enable the Board, if the county council fail to take action, to direct the Commissioners without further delay themselves to prepare a scheme.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: No such case has yet arisen.

Mr. MORRELL: Under Section 2, subsection (3), is it not the duty of the Commissioners as soon as they are aware there is a demand for land to at once make a report to the Board?

An HON. MEMBER: Will the hon. Gentleman give the Commissioners instructions on that point?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Really hon. Members who have so many Questions to ask should put them on the Paper. They are of a highly technical character, and it is not fair to a Minister who is answering for a Minister in the other House not to give him full notice.

Small Holdings in Monmouthshire.

Mr. THOMAS RICHARDS (Monmouthshire, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the county of Monmouth 265 persons have applied for small holdings; that 113 of these have been approved; that is is estimated that 1,484 acres will be required to satisfy them; that none of the applicants have yet been provided for and no land acquired; and what steps he proposes to take.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are aware of the position in Monmouth. One of their inspectors recently inspected a farm for which the county council are negotiating, and the Board are satisfied that the county council intend to carry out the Act to the best of their ability.

Scottish Education Bill.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Scotland if he would state the various deputations from Scotland that have waited on him in connection with the Education (Scotland) Bill, giving the total number of such.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): I have a record of sixteen deputations from Scotland which have waited upon me in connection with the Education (Scotland) Bill. The names of the various authorities represented by these deputations cannot conveniently be narrated in a verbal answer, but I will send the hon. Member a list of them.

MR. PIRIE: How many of the deputations were due to the somewhat unparalled action of His Majesty's Government in changing the scheme of allocation originally proposed and indeed adopted on the Second Reading of the Bill?

MR. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend knows that that is a matter of argument, and we do not take the same views on it.

MR. PIRIE: I am not asking as to a matter of argument, but as to numbers of the deputation.

MR. WATT: Can the right hon. Gentleman give an estimate of the cost to the ratepayers of these deputations?

MR. SINCLAIR: That question should be addressed to the authorities concerned.

MR. PIRIE: In view of the number of deputations, does the right hon. Gentleman still consider this Bill to be non-contentious?

MR. SINCLAIR: It certainly is not a highly controversial Bill.

MR. PIRIE: How many deputations are required to make a Bill contentious?

[No Answer was returned.]

Scottish Public Meetings.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his Department have issued lantern slides to be used at public meetings in Scotland; and, if so, under what Vote is such expenditure accounted for.

MR. SINCLAIR: The reply is in the negative, but if the right hon. Member will inform me specifically to what he refers I shall be happy to make inquiries.

MR MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that slides have been used at Liberal meetings in the South of Scotland?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Intermediate Education.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can obtain from the Intermediate Board a precise definition of the meaning they attach to the addition to Rule 49, which states that the exhibitions assigned to the literary course will be allotted equally between Divisions 1 and 2; does this refer to a minimum number of exhibitions only or has it another and, if so, what signification.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Commissioners of Intermediate Education inform me that the statement in Rule 49 refers to a minimum number of exhibitions only. There is nothing in the Rule to prevent the Commissioners from allotting additional exhibitions to either division of the modern literary course if the number of students and the standards attained should justify the award of additional exhibitions.

Mr. Fetherston's Milltown Ranch.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state when Mr. Fetherston's ranch at Milltown, near Castle-pollard, purchased by the Estates Commissioners, will be distributed.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are not at present in a position to say when the lands referred to will be distributed.

Irish Land Purchase.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can, by reference to the number of vendors and mortgagees of estates sold and arranged to be sold under the Land Act of 1903 from the 1st November of that year to 1st November, 1908, who reside out of Ireland, estimate approximately the proportions of the aggregate price and bonus going to residents out of Ireland and the proportion going to residents in Ireland.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Land Commission have no information as to the proportions of the aggregate purchase money and bonus which have gone to residents in and outside Ireland, respectively.

Pakenham Estate, Westmeath.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the interest of local peace and the success of their scheme for distributing the untenanted land on the Pakenham estate in Westmeath, the Estates Commissioners will reconsider the purpose ascribed to them of planting on that land persons objectionable to the community, such as bailiffs from other estates who should be provided for by their employers; and whether, in a matter affecting the pockets of the local ratepayers, a draft scheme of distribution will be submitted to the representatives of those ratepayers, and their views thereon considered.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners will carefully consider all the circumstances before deciding on the mode in which the untenanted land on this estate is to be dealt with, and will have due regard to any representations that may be submitted on behalf of the people of the locality. The reply to the concluding part of the Question is in the negative.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Are we to understand the Estates Commissioners will give due regard to representations from the people of a locality denouncing particular men as being bailiffs and prevent them having an allotment?

Mr. BIRRELL: Nothing of the kind, Sir.

County Cavan Derelict Lands.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what was the date of the lodgment of objections by J. S. Winter and another and Samuel Saunderson, owners of untenanted land in County Cavan, to the compulsory acquisition of their derelict lands under the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907; and will he have the hon. Member for West Cavan supplied with a copy of the aforesaid objections.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that objections under Section 2 (1) of the Evicted Tenants Act were lodged against the compulsory acquisition of the lands of J. S. Winter, and another on 25th May and 6th June last. Objections to the acquisition of the lands of Samuel Saunderson were lodged on 25th and 28th of May last. Copies of such objections can be obtained from the Keeper of the Records of the Land Commission in the manner prescribed by the Statutory Rules.

In reply to a further Question the right hon. Gentleman said copies of the objections could be obtained on making a preliminary payment.

Martyn Estate, County Clare.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the tenants on the Martyn estate, County Clare, are still paying 3½ per cent. on the purchase money, although this money was paid over to the vendor since 1906; and if he can state why the tenants are asked still to pay more than the 3¼ per cent. arranged for under the purchase agreement.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that this estate was purchased by them for purposes of resale, and they hope to vest the holdings in the purchasing tenants at an early date. The purchase money was advanced to the vendor in 1907. Until the holdings are vested in the tenants, they are liable for interest in lieu of rent at 3½ per cent., in accordance with the terms of their purchase agreements, and the provisions of Section 18 (1) of the Act.

Curraheen Schools.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in spite of frequent representations on the subject, no proper facilities have been granted by the National Board of Education for the construction of new schools at Curraheen, Glenbeigh, to take the place of the existing Keelnabrack School which has been condemned as unsafe for use; and can he say what steps, if any, will be taken to have the new school built.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that a grant of two-thirds of the estimated cost of providing a new school at Curraheen for the pupils of the Keelnabrack School was sanctioned in April last, but the manager declined the offer upon the ground that, owing to the poverty of the district, he was unable to guarantee the remaining third. The Commissioners were not until recently in a position to consider an application for a larger grant, but they are now making investigations in connection with the manager's representations as to the poverty of the district, in order to determine whether a grant in excess of two-thirds of the cost of the new buildings can be allowed in this case.

Ireland and the Unemployed Grant.

Mr. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in how many cases have applications been made to the Local Government Board in Ireland for grants from the Parliamentary Vote under the Unemployed Workman Act; what grants have been made; and how many applications have been refused or postponed.

Mr. BIRRELL: Grants from the Parliamentary Vote in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workman Act can only be made to distress committees duly constituted under the Act. Applications have been received by the Local Government Board for such grants from the following districts in which committees have been, or are being, formed: Dublin, Belfast, Londonderry, Limerick, Drogheda, Kingstown, Ennis. The applications from the Dublin and Belfast Committees have been already acceded to. The Board are at present in correspondence with the other local authorities mentioned, with a view to securing sufficient information to enable them to deal with the applications. The Board have also received applications from districts which contain less than the minimum population prescribed for the establishment of separate distress committees under the Act. These applications cannot be entertained.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Why has not the application from Ennis been granted?

Mr. BIRRELL: We are supplying Ennis with the materials which will enable them to make out a case which I hope will receive ready acceptance.

Mr. KETTLE: Does the responsibility for making the grant rest with the Irish Local Government Board or the Treasury?

Mr. BIRRELL: With the Treasury.

Pike Farm, North Tipperary.

Mr. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the total amount of purchase money advanced to Mr. William Carroll, under the Ashbourne Act, to enable him to purchase from Mr. William Trench the lands known as the Pike farm, in Ballingarry, North Tipperary.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Land Commission inform me that on 8th August, 1890, an advance of £735 was made to Dalton Carroll for the purchase of a holding of 147 acres on the estate of William Thomas Trench, at Ballingarry, County Tipperary.

Land Purchase in North Tipperary.

Mr. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the total area of the land that Mr. H. Davis Kenny, of Ballingarry, North Tipperary, has purchased with the assistance of the Land Commission, and what is the total amount of purchase-money that has been advanced by the Land Commissioners in favour of Mr. Davis Kenny.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Land Commission inform me that the total area purchased by Mr. Kenny under the Land Purchase Acts is 211 acres, and that the amount advanced to him was £3,000.

Mr. HOGAN: Did he purchase the interest under the Ashbourne Act?

Mr. BIRRELL: Really, I never heard of Mr. Kenny before.

Mr. MOORE: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that Mr. Kenny has been boycotted and the hunt broken up and he himself assaulted because the right hon. Gentleman would not afford him adequate protection?

Mr. REDDY (King's County, Birr): And have not the people the right to break up the hunt?

Mr. MOORE: No.

Mr. REDDY: Yes; the farmers have.

Irish Cottage Industries.

Mr. MULDOON (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether the definition given to the words home and cottage industries, in Section 30 of the Act creating the Department, by the Law Officers in Ireland has operated to prevent the Department assisting some cottage industries within the spirit but outside the letter of the Law; and whether he proposes next session to secure an amending Bill to remedy this defect.

Mr. BIRRELL: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The second query is under consideration.

Ireland and the Unemployed Grant.

Mr. KETTLE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any allocation has yet been made between Great Britain and Ireland of the Parliamentary Vote available under the Unemployed Workmen Act; and, if so, how much has been allocated to the separate use of Ireland.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: It is not possible at present to allocate any definite sum to Ireland, as the information available with regard to the necessities of the several localities affected in the United Kingdom is not sufficient for the purpose. Every application for assistance is considered on its merits.

Mr. KETTLE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that under the plan of allocation in 1906 Ireland got £11,000 while in 1907 when a different plan was introduced, she only got £4,500.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: It looks as if Ireland got more than she was really entitled to in the first year.

English Historical Monuments Commission.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that while other societies, such as the Royal Archæological Institute, the Royal Institute of British Architects, and the British Archæological Association, were each formally invited to submit names to serve on the English Historical Monuments Commission, no such invitation has been sent to the Society of Antiquaries of London, which has thus no official representation on the Commission; and whether he can state the reason why the Society of Antiquaries has been ignored.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): As I was unaware who among the members of the societies referred to by the hon. and gallant Member was best suited to assist on the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments, I invited these societies to submit names to me. The prominent position of the Society of Antiquaries made it unnecessary for me to follow the same course in their case, and in accordance with the usual practice, I used my own discretion in the selection of members from that body to serve on the Commission. The fact that out of the eleven members of the Commission five are Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries—one of them having been President of the Society for many years—should, to my mind, be sufficient proof that neither in intention nor in practice has the Society of Antiquaries been ignored.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman let me have the names of the five members ?

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, they are well-known.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): Can the Prime Minister tell us what the business will be on Friday ?

MR. ASQUITH: On Friday we propose to submit to the House a Resolution for the allocation of time for the later stages of the Education Bill. When that is disposed of, we shall take up some of the smaller Bills.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 379.]

LUNACY BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 380.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A. (in respect of the Criminal Appeal (Amendment) [Lords] and of the White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bills); Mr. Attorney-General and Mr. Halpin; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bills); Mr. Solicitor-General and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

MEAT MARKING (IRELAND) BILL.

"To identify all imported meat, whether fresh or frozen, and to provide that it shall not be sold as native produce," presented by Mr. Field; supported by Mr. Hayden, Mr. Condon, and Mr. Farrell; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, next, and to be printed. [Bill 381.]

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISABILITIES.

*MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said the Bill which he asked leave to introduce was practically the same measure which had been before Parliament for a good many years. It was introduced on several occasions by Members representing Irish constituencies on behalf of the Irish Party, but he regretted to say that, owing to the difficulty which private Members found in making progress with their measure, hitherto this Bill had never got beyond the introduction stage. He was taking a perhaps somewhat unusual course in asking leave to say a few words in explanation of the Bill, but he thought that course was advisable in view of the fact that it had come to his knowledge that there had been a good deal of misrepresentation with regard to the scope and object of the measure. Its object was plain, simple, and explicit. It was to place the Catholic population on terms of equality with people of other denominations. That was the real object of the Bill. The Catholics claimed for themselves and their religion, equality; they asked for no more, and they certainly would be satisfied with no less. It might be a surprise to many Members of the House—he knew it was a surprise to a number of people outside—to know that people of the Catholic religion at the present time did not as a matter of fact enjoy equality with other denominations. The popular belief, he was sure, was that the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 removed all grievances of which the Catholics could legitimately complain, and yet the real fact was that there still remained upon the Statute Book a considerable number of enactments which were not only irritating and unjust, but in their nature grossly insulting to the people of the Catholic faith. in this country. As a matter of fact, the so-called Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 itself contained several sections of the most offensive character with reference to the people of the Catholic religion. He had no time to deal in detail with the various enactments which it was proposed to repeal, which still existed in reference to Catholics, but by way of illustration he would refer the House to one or two sections of the Catholic Emancipation Act itself. From Sections 26 to 38 of the Act of 1829 called the Catholic Relief Act there were provisions of the most offensive character towards Catholics. For instance, there were provisions which made it an absolutely penal offence for Catholic clergymen to celebrate any of the rites or ceremonies of their religion, or even to wear the habits of their orders anywhere outside the Catholic places of worship or private houses; and Section 28 of the Act of 1829 frankly made the following declaration—

> "Whereas Jesuits and members of certain religious orders, convents, and societies of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or other rules, are resident within the United Kingdom, and it is expedient to make provision for their gradual suppression and final prohibition within the United Kingdom, be it enacted."

And then there was a series of sections of the most violent and insulting character aiming at the suppression of all these religious orders in the Catholic Church. There were provisions which made it obligatory on members of the Jesuit and other orders highly respected in this country to register themselves, to give notice of their numbers to the clerks of the peace in the various districts, and to send notices of their presence in England, to the Home Secretary, and in Ireland, to the Chief Secretary, in order that they might be registered, very much in the way in which ticket-of-leave men were. He was certain that there were no Members in the House belonging to any denomination at all who would refuse to admit that some of the best educational establishments in this country were conducted by members of these very religious orders against which these penal enactments were in existence, and he was certain that no fair-minded man could feel surprise that a great deal of irritation and resentment was felt at this time of the world's history at the presence upon the Statute-book of England of provisions of this character. The answer might be made to him that, while it was true that these obnoxious and old-time provisions still remained, they were obsolete. They were told that they were dead letters, and were never put in force. Surely that was a greater reason for their removal from the Statute-book, because if they never intended to put these laws into force, there was certainly no reason whatever for retaining them, in view of the irritation which they caused to millions of people of a particular denomination throughout the whole of the Empire. In 1902 an application was made to a magistrate in London to put these laws into operation against certain Jesuit fathers in this city, and the magistrate, Mr. Kennedy, declared and quoted Sir James Stephen's "History of the Criminal Law" to show that these provisions had been treated as a dead letter. The King's Bench was appealed to, and the decision of the magistrate upheld. Mr. Justice Darling, in his judgment, said that whatever might have been the reasons for passing these statutes, which persecuted opinion and not acts, they were against the spirit and the genius of the age. Lord Mansfield said that, properly speaking, they were never designed to be enforced at all; they were made merely *in terrorem.* Was it, therefore, remarkable that the millions of Catholics of this country should object to have laws of this character held *in terrorem* over their heads? He passed on to another provision in the Bill, in which he also proposed to include the provisions of the Catholic Removal of Disabilities Bill, introduced by Mr. Gladstone in 1891. The Bill was backed by all the leading members of the Liberal Party; it was supported in eloquent speeches by Mr. Gladstone himself, Sir Henry James, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and the present Prime Minister. The object of that Bill was to remove the disqualification of a Catholic for occupying the position of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland or Lord Chancellor of England. In 1837 the prohibition of Catholics filling the position of Lord Chancellor of Ireland was removed. Speaking of this disqualification the present Prime Minister said in 1891—

> "Sixty years ago, the principles of religious exclusion were entrenched in this country behind an imposing fortress of legal safeguards and securities. One after another of the strong places has been captured, and its walls battered down, until all that remains is this paltry little corner, a solitary and belated relic of the past, which can never be rebuilt. The finger of fate is upon it, and although by your votes you may for a few years retard, depend upon it, you cannot evade, its downfall."

He asked the right hon. Gentleman to act up to the spirit of that very broad-minded declaration. He also proposed in this Bill to deal with the very offensive references which were made to the millions of his Catholic subjects by the King in the Accession Declaration. It was said, he knew not with what truth, that this was a declaration not to the liking of His Majesty himself, but be that as it might, it was admitted a few years ago by all parties in the country and in the House of Lords that the references made to Catholics in the Accession Declaration were grossly and unnecessarily offensive in every way. Unfortunately, no agreement could be come to, although everyone expressed a desire to come to an agreement as to the words to be put in the Declaration in substitution of the offensive phrases, but he proposed in this Bill to endeavour to find words in reference to transubstantiation, and to omit the following words—

> "That the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the celebration of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous."

He was sure there was not a Member in that House who would refuse to agree that references of that kind were grossly offensive and palpably untrue. No Catholic extended adoration to the Blessed Virgin or any other saint. In the Catholic Church as in other churches adoration was reserved for God. In conclusion, he appealed to Members in all quarters of the House not to regard this in any sense as a party matter. He himself represented one of the most Catholic constituencies in the wide world—the constituency which returned O'Connell to this House and had a great deal to do with the emancipation of Catholics, both in this country and in Ireland. He believed he could say of every Catholic in this Empire that they of the Catholic Church had no greater desire or ambition than to live in the utmost friendship and goodwill with their fellow-citizens of every denomination. But that could not be the case so long as laws of an unjust and insulting character were retained upon the Statute-book. It was one of the proudest memories of Ireland to-day that Catholic emancipation was carried forward in an Irish Protestant Parliament, Grattan's Parliament, long before the question was taken up in this country. This Bill was supported by both Catholic and Protestant, and he believed that throughout the country broad-minded men, Catholic and Protestant alike, would welcome this effort to do away with what remained of the bad old times. He asked hon. Members to pass the Bill through the House to promote that good feeling, that spirit of friendship and comradeship among all sections of the community, which could never thoroughly exist so long as the members of one communion were signalled out for unjust, unnecessary, and insulting legislation.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to remove certain disabilities affecting the Roman Catholic population, and to make certain alterations in the Accession Declaration."—(*Mr. William Redmond.*)

*MR. MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale) agreed that the hon. Member who had just spoken had taken a very unusual course, as he had truly said in his speech, in introducing a controversial Bill of this nature under the ten minutes rule. That peculiarity was enhanced by the fact that there would be no prospect during this session of taking any further stage of the Bill, and therefore the House must now express approval or disapproval of its principle. The Hon. Member proposed to modify the Oath, which guaranteed the Protestant succession to the Crown; and further, in advocating the same measure for Catholics as for Protestants, the hon. Member was really asking for the removal of those disabilities which now attached to the succession to the Crown. The next object of the Bill was to legalise monastic institutions. Why were they illegal at present? Was it not because Parliament in 1829 knew more about the true character of these institutions than we did to-day? The speeches made at that time showed that these orders were excluded because it was believed that the Jesuits in particular advocated doctrines which were dangerous to the State, at variance with public morality, and opposed to civil and religious liberty. The fact that these organisations had been driven out of France tended to show that they had not changed their character in the intervening years. The number of these institutions in Great Britain had increased from sixteen in 1829 to 1,125 at present, so that the absence of a legal *status* involved no practical disability. While he was quite willing that the question of the legalisation of monastic orders should be considered by the Government of the day, he held that it should be considered in connection with the need for the inspection of these institutions. As to the third object of the Bill, the legalising of Roman Catholic processions in the streets, he himself would rather see further restrictions applied not only to Roman Catholics but to all religious bodies. The streets were not the place for religious processions and demonstrations. In addition to that he would remind his hon. friend that this, after all, was a Protestant country, and that while the carrying of the Host in procession might be desired by Roman Catholics it would be a very offensive proceeding to Protestants. There was one further reason for which he would ask the House to reject this Bill; it was that the Roman Catholic Church, while it had always been willing to accept toleration, had never been willing to grant it to others. ["Oh."] That was true all the world over. Wherever ecclesiastical power was supreme, whether in Spain, in Malta, or in Ireland, there was persecution. He asserted to-day that the lot of Protestants in Ireland was infinitely worse than the lot of Catholics in Great Britain. They frequently read in the newspapers of the persecution of Protestants in Ireland. For instance, only the other day, at Riversdale, in County Sligo, Protestants, because they refused to join the National League, were subjected to the most severe boycott and intimidation. On its merits he trusted the House would condemn this Bill as one which was not required to deal with any immediate grievance, and as one which would condone lawlessness on a very large scale. He asked those who believed in our Protestant Constitution as the guarantee of civil and religious liberty, for Protestant and Catholic alike, to join him in voting against the introduction of the Bill.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 48. (Division List No. 412.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, Sir John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness

Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,RtHn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats,Sir T.(Renfrew,W
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Herbert,Col.Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt, Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N.
Meehan,Patrick A.(Queen's Co.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montague, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pease,RtHnJA(Saffron Walden
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick, Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Leslie
Richards,T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Watt, Henry A.
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clark, George Smith
Clough, William
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craig, Captain James(Down,E.)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Gordon, J.
Guinness,Hon.R. (Haggerston)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Houston, Robert Paterson

Kekewich, Sir George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Rose, Charles Day
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. M'Arthur and Mr. Moore.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. William Redmond, Captain Donelan, Lord Edmund Talbot, Mr. Boland, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Haviland Burke, and Mr. Young.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISABILITIES (REMOVAL), &c., BILL.

"To remove certain Disabilities affecting the Roman Catholic population, and to make certain alterations in the Accession Declaration," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 7th December, and to be printed. [Bill 382.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PREVENTION OF CRIME BILL).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Prevention of Crime Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 272; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 413.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner. J. F. L (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Havilnad-
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Burrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George

Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, Capt Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.)
Clark, George Smith
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
Law Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt Hn Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Renton, Leslie
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.

Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Lord Balcarres.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

As amended (in the Standing Committee), further considered.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said the object of the first Amendment on the Paper was to meet the particular difficulties of the Merchant Company which had established superannuation funds in connection with its schools. It would be wrong, of course, to penalise that company as compared with other educational undertakings, and they wished, therefore, as this superannuation was founded by a central board and not by the governors of each separate school, to provide that they should come under Clause 12.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 5, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided further that where, prior to the commencement of this Act, a governing body as aforesaid or any joint or central board on their behalf have established a superannuation fund to which they respectively contribute, directly or indirectly, the superannuation allowance awarded to a teacher to the extent represented by the sum so contributed shall be held to be a retiring allowance within the meaning of this section.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 21, after the word 'boards,' to insert the words 'governing bodies.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) in moving to omit the words "in Scotland" from Clause 13, said the Amendment dealt with the position of teachers who might have been employed in England for part of their teaching period, and who subsequently, especially in connection with certain denominations in more or less voluntary schools, took up work in Scotland. These teachers, while they had perhaps a longer period of teaching experience, found themselves side by side with teachers who had a much shorter period of work, but who had a claim upon the superannuation scheme, in which they only participated themselves to a very small extent—only for that portion of their experience as teachers which lay within the area of Scotland. In order more or less to obtain an expression of opinion from the right hon. Gentleman, and to bring their case under his attention, he moved the Amendment.

Amendment not seconded.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 10, line 28, after the word 'Department,' to insert the words 'or of a teacher's superannuation allowance from a governing body as aforesaid or any joint or central board on their behalf.'"

"In page 10, line 34, to leave out the word 'or.'"

"In page 10, line 34, after the word 'managers,' to insert the words 'or joint or central board.'"

"In page 10, line 34, at end, to insert the words 'or superannuation.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

*MR. SPEAKER: The next Amendment[†] in the name of the hon. Member for Ayrshire would involve a fresh charge.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) pointed out that it did not involve a fresh charge at all on the Exchequer. The fund to which he referred here was one made up by contributions from the teachers, and they were absolutely entitled to get the benefit of the fund.

[†] The following is the Amendment referred to—

"In page 10, line 40, after the word 'prescribed,' to insert the words "Provided that the Treasury shall make payment to any teacher who shall make application, and from whose salary deductions have been made under the said Act, but who has ceased to serve as a teacher before this scheme takes effect, a sum equal to the full amount of such deductions, which payment shall cancel the right of such teacher to any annuity under the said Act; and further.'"—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

*Mr. SPEAKER: The words are, "the Treasury shall make payment." They do not say the Treasury shall make payment out of any particular fund. It must involve a charge and impose a duty upon the Treasury of making certain payments.

Mr. COCHRANE: All I desire is that the Treasury shall repay contributions which have already been made to them and which are allocated to the teachers in certain proportions, not that there shall be any fresh charge, but that they shall simply repay the money paid by the teachers out of their own pocket.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That does not appear on the face of the Amendment. The only way to construe the Amendment is that the Treasury shall make the payment. It does not say it is to make it out of a fund subscribed to by the teachers, and it does not earmark a particular fund.

Mr. COCHRANE: From whose salaries deductions have been made.

*Mr. SPEAKER: It does not say from what fund.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, line 16, to leave out the word 'may,' and to insert the word 'shall.'"

"In page 11, line 16, at end, to insert the words 'or of an Amendment thereof.'"

"In page 11, line 26, after the word 'boards,' to insert the words 'governing bodies.'"

"In page 11, line 26, after the word 'and,' to insert the word 'other.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) moved to omit subsection (1) of Clause 14. He said he hoped to prove that the announcement made by the Secretary for Scotland that voluntary schools were to benefit to the extent of an extra 2s. was not such a generous gift as it appeared to be. Under subsections (2) and (4) his contention was that there would be brought into the Scottish Education Fund those very amounts out of which State-aided schools had in the past been able to benefit. The probate and estate duties which were brought into the Scottish Education Fund did not, as a matter of fact, form any fixed amount but an anually increasing sum. The actual increase of those duties was more than the increase in the cost of pupils in the schools. As the hon. Member for Sheffield pointed out in a previous debate, there had been an illegal accumulation of funds whilst the duties were being administered. Whilst it might be contended that voluntary schools would benefit under Clauses 15 and 16, it would be recognised that this was the only opportunity he would have of pointing out in what way the Catholic schools were not getting justice. Briefly, subsections (1) and (4) constituted the fund which gave the extra fee grant of 2s. per child out of purely Scottish money, and it would be found on looking into the Returns already issued that the sum fixed was £40,000. In subsection (4) of Clause 14 the amount was about £69,000, giving a total of £109,000. The average attendance of children in Scotland was 720,000 and that would work out at about 3s. per child. Under Clauses 15 and 16 it might be said that the Catholic schools were going to benefit to the extent of 2s., but 1s. of that amount came out of money which the Catholic schools would have had under the operation of the estate duties. Therefore instead of the voluntary schools of Scotland, equally with the board schools, benefiting by an increase of 2s. or 2s. 6d., as far as he could make out the real increase was not 2s., but really only 1s. 6d. This explained the dissatisfaction with which this measure was regarded by the Catholics in Scotland. He was not taking up this line of argument on account of any settled opposition to the Bill, but in the hope that the reasonable claims of Catholics would be met. He hoped that when they got to the cumulative vote the Secretary for Scotland would see his way to meet them on that point, because if he did a great deal of their opposition would go. He thought it was important to point out that under the two subsections he had mentioned sums of money were being brought in out of which Catholic schools gained a slight benefit and in the new Scottish Education Fund it was not possible for the right hon. Gentleman to substantiate what he had stated, that the voluntary schools were really going to benefit to the extent of 2s. or 2s. 6d. per child.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 12, line 26, to leave out subsection (1) of Clause 14."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. SINCLAIR said he did what he could to answer the hon. Member's arguments the other day on the general position, and on the position of voluntary schools under the Bill. The Amendment was to omit the first subsection of Clause 14, and the hon. Member was quite right in saying that under that subsection the money provided by it, together with the money provided in subsection (4), constituted the security for making up the fee grant in Scotland. It was apprehended that as those sums were no longer available there might be danger that the fee grant in those schools in which the hon. Member for South Kerry was interested might not secure the 12s. per head in the future. He wished to point out that in subsection (6), so far from it being the case that they were weakening the security for the maintenance of the fee grant in voluntary schools or to all schools at 12s., the position would really be strengthened, because hitherto only the particular sum mentioned in subsections (1) and (2) had constituted the security for keeping the fee grant at 12s., whereas now the whole fund formed that security. That was really the position stated as clearly and precisely as he could put it. So far as the precise point raised in the Amendment was concerned he was able to assure the hon. Member that the security they were now taking for the 12s. grant was even greater than it had been in the past. He hoped that so far as this clause was concerned he had been able to reassure the hon. Member that the position of the schools in which he was interested would be safeguarded.

Amendment put, and negatived.

*MR. LAMONT said that, in moving the Amendment standing in his name, he did so, not from a sentimental point of view, but from a strong conviction of the advantages of bilingualism from a practical and utilitarian point of view, and of the value of Gaelic as a mental exercise.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) asked if the subjects referred to in the Amendment were not excluded by the ruling that such matters were dealt with administratively by the Code.

*MR. SPEAKER: The point raised is whether the subjects dealt with in this Amendment ought to be dealt with administratively by Code. I will give the hon. Member the benefit of the doubt, and he may proceed with his Amendment.

*MR. LAMONT said the present position was that Gaelic might be taught in any school in the Highland districts, but that it was rather discouraged by the inspectors. Secondly, there was the so-called Gaelic grant of £10 to each school having Gaelic-speaking children and a Gaelic-speaking teacher, but this money, unfortunately, was often used, not to increase the teachers' salary, but to reduce the rates. Thirdly, provision for Gaelic was nominally made at junior-student centres, but at many of them it was impossible to obtain such instruction. In the fourth place, Gaelic had this year, for the first time, been graded as a higher, as well as a lower, subject in the Department's examinations. Further than this, it was impossible to discover whether anything was being done for Gaelic in the multitude of Blue-books, Reports, Circulars and Minutes with which the Department, like a cuttle-fish, darkened all around it, and endeavoured to baffle the public. The two most pressing present needs were those dealt with in his Amendment. First, that the bilingual Gaelic child must always first be taught in Gaelic, because it was impossible that general education could ever efficiently be given in a language with which a child was totally unfamiliar. At present a Gaelic child was often in the position of reading only a language which it could not understand, and of understanding only a language which it could not read. Next, that they must create an adequate supply of Gaelic-speaking teachers. The Amendment met these needs by making a better provision for instruction, and by increasing the number of bursaries, so as to increase gradually the supply of teachers. The Amendment had received practically unanimous support throughout the Highlands—even from Inverness, which had opposed the Amendments which he had moved in Committee upstairs. Its terms had been arrived at after consultation between "An Cornunn Gaidhealach" and other associations and individuals interested in this question. Aberdeen University had just decided to place Gaelic on an equal footing with French and German in their bursary competitions; and the Provincial Committee of Aberdeen had arranged for Gaelic-speaking students to study Gaelic at their training college. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would not lag behind in a movement for the educational advantage of a part of Scotland where, more than anywhere, education was appreciated; and where, more than anywhere, education was synonymous with success. He begged to move.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire), in seconding the Amendment, explained that it was brought up in Committee, but ruled out of order for a technical reason. He and his friends were therefore obliged to bring it before the House on the Report stage. He regarded this as a most important proposal, the desire being that children who had learned to speak nothing but Gaelic in their homes should receive instruction through the medium of a language which they understood. A point which he wished to urge was that children who were brought up to speak two languages were given an increased advantage in learning a third. He impressed upon the Government that the districts affected by this proposal were in the poorest counties in Scotland. The necessary funds must be got either under Clause 15 from the central fund, or under Clause 16 from the fund at the disposal of the county councils.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 10, at end, to insert the words, '(*f*) To making payments to school boards in Gaelic-speaking districts of such sums as may be necessary to make adequate provision for instruction in reading and writing the Gaelic language, and also of such sums as may be necessary to increase the number of bursaries available, both before and after the junior student stage, for Gaelic-speaking children intending to become teachers.' "—(*Mr. Lamont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said this question was discussed in Committee to some extent. Hon. Members who had studied the Bill knew that in subsection (9) of Clause 16, the continuance of such grants as were now given to this purpose was provided for. They could be given subject to the discretion of the school boards and the district committees. The question was whether they should upset that or not. The Committee had much sympathy with the views expressed by the hon. Member for Argyllshire as to the desirability of giving full permission to those people who wished their children to learn Gaelic and to make use of that language. He did not wish to argue the general question as to the advantage of bilingual teaching and accomplishments of that kind. His hon. friend proposed by this Amendment to lay the charge for Gaelic-teaching as a charge upon the national funds—that was to say, he proposed that the Lowland counties which had no interest whatever in Gaelic-teaching should be obliged perforce to contribute to the cost of such Gaelic-teaching as was desired in the Gaelic counties. That was not a proposal which in the interest of Gaelic-teaching should be accepted by the House. He thought it was far better to adhere to the position taken up in Committee, namely, that this was a matter which could safely be left to the discretion of the local authorities themselves. The local authorities could open the door wide for the teaching of Gaelic. As had been stated by his hon. friend, facilities and encouragement had been given in the last year or two for the increase of this form of teaching. Reference had been made to the poverty of the Highland districts, but it must be remembered that they had already special grants for this and other purposes. The best course for the House to take in the interest of Gaelic-teaching was to leave this matter as it was.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said the right hon. Gentleman had not quite done justice to the Amendment. Although it was moved and seconded by Highland Members, he would give some reasons in his capacity as a Lowland Member why this should not be treated as a Highland question. It was a national question, not only in the sentimental sense, but in the sense that it was desirable to encourage the teaching of languages. It would be a matter of interest to the whole of Scotland that French and German should be well taught, which, he might add, was very seldom the case. The Gaelic language would be well taught if adequate provision were made for teaching it. The likelihood was that Gaelic would be very much better taught than French or German. In that sense it was a national question. The teaching of languages under the Code had been unduly discouraged in the case of certain children in favour of science. No doubt the Highlands felt strongly on this point, but it was unlikely that under the present parish board system, the teaching of French or German would be very prevalent. By arranging for the teaching of Gaelic the children of the Highlands would get their one chance of learning another language. He thought the Amendment could be defended on sentimental grounds, but that was not his present purpose.

Mr. BOLAND hoped the Government would accept the Amendment. Speaking with a knowledge of what had been done to develop the Irish language, to which Gaelic was closely akin, he strongly supported the view put forward by the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs as to the educational value to children in the Gaelic-speaking parts of Scotland of learning their own language thoroughly and of having the opportunity of learning another. He knew a young fellow in Kerry who had a knowledge of the Irish language, and at the age of twenty-three he learned to read and write the language. This had created in him a desire to learn foreign languages, but if he had been deprived of the opportunity of learning the Irish language, his desire to learn French or German would probably never have been felt. He very much regretted that this should be regarded as a merely Highland question. It was a national question and it should be so regarded throughout Scotland. If the hon. Member who moved challenged a division, the Irish Party would be delighted to give the Amendment their hearty support.

*Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he was much disappointed at the speech of the Secretary for Scotland, and at the attitude he had taken up with regard to the teaching of Gaelic in the Highlands. An hon. Member had said that this was a national question, but he looked upon it as an Imperial question. Nearly all Highlanders in the Western Highlands and Islands spoke Gaelic only in their homes, but in the parish schools English was thrust upon children whose knowledge was limited to Gaelic. In a few schools pupil teachers knew Gaelic, but schools and the Scottish Education Department were opposed, to the teaching of Gaelic. What chance had any Highland boy or girl of learning any language other than English? The parish school boards had not the means to employ teachers to teach French, German, Italian or Spanish. Gaelic was the only language besides English which the children in these schools had a chance of learning. As the Amendment was supported by all the Members representing Gaelic-speaking districts in which there were thousands of old people who were quite unable to speak anything but Gaelic, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his decision. There were Highlanders in all parts of the world—great soldiers, great statesmen, great commercial men, who had attained to their high position, not because they spoke Gaelic, but because it had materially helped them to acquire other languages. He sincerely hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said he made no apology whatever for saying a few words on this Amendment. It had been said that no vote had been changed by argument in the House. Well in this case, his was an example of the exception which proved the rule. To tell the truth he had come into the House with a preconceived prejudice against the Amendment, but after listening to the debate the only argument that he had heard against it, if it could be called an argument, was that the Lowland counties would be made to pay for teaching a language which was not their own. Surely that argument cut both ways. Why should the Highland counties be made to pay for the teaching of a language that was not their own, viz., English? He was a Member for a Lowland constituency in which there were not many Gaelic-speaking people; but he was sure that everyone in his constituency would willingly bear the burden of doing justice to a large, a gallant, and a noble section of the community.

MR. SINCLAIR appealed to his hon. friend not to press his Amendment to a division. The hon. Member knew as well as he did that their system in Scotland was to leave such subjects to be taught under the Code as in the discretion of the school board it was thought the children required or desired. There was no dispute amongst them as to the desirability of Gaelic teaching in Gaelic districts. The question was, with whom should the decision lie? Were they to give to all school boards in all Gaelic speaking districts a claim on national funds for teaching Gaelic? If so, the logical corollary of the Amendment was to give the Lowland districts a claim on the national funds for the teaching of French, German or Italian, or any other language. It was not a question as to whether it was to be done, but how it was to be done.

MR. COCHRANE pointed out that the right hon. Gentleman had already made two speeches on this unimportant question, which had been very thoroughly threshed out in the Committee upstairs, when the solution come to was that Gaelic should be taught by Gaelic teachers. He thought the time of the House should be taken up with the discussion of much more important Amendments.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he was sorry to occupy the time of the House, but he desired to press the fact that their constituents in the Highlands wanted this Amendment to be carried. His right hon. friend said that if the Amendment were carried the Lowlands would have a right to demand that French, German, and Italian should be taught in their schools. But that was not a fair way to put it. What the Highland Members asked was that their native language should be taught to the natives of the Highlands. What they were afraid of was that there were a large number of people who wanted to kill the Gaelic language; they, on the other hand, wanted to preserve it, and to give the Highland children proper opportunities of learning it. He was extremely sorry that his right hon. friend could not see his way to give way, seeing that Parliament did not give too much to the Highland people.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 109; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 414.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ambrose, Robert
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Boland, John
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan)
Essex, R. W.
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh (Donegal, W.)
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A (Queen'sCo.)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton

Mooney, J. J.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murhpy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph R.
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Shee, James John
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur W. A. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rainy, A. Rolland
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Snowden, P.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Walsh, Stephen
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhougton)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lamont and Mr. Ainsworth.

NOES.

Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clark, George Smith
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Moore, William
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.

Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Rt. Hn. H. L. (Cleveland)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Stanger, H. Y.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Thornton, Percy M.
Vivian, Henry
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn E. (Clackmannan
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Winterton, Earl
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES — Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. J. M. MACDONALD (Falkirk Burghs) rose to move the omission of subsection (2) in Clause 15.

MR. BOLAND said he wished to move an Amendment before that of the hon. Gentleman, viz: in page 14, line 17, at end, to insert the words, "(*g*) To paying, in respect of all children attending schools other than board schools eligible for grants under the Code, a sum not exceeding ten shillings per head of the children in average attendance at such schools, and such sum shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, any grants which, before the passing of this Act, were payable to such schools."

*MR. SPEAKER said that that was the same matter that they discussed a fortnight ago, and the House came to a decision upon it. The wording was almost identically the same, and the hon. Member could not discuss it a second time.

MR. BOLAND inquired whether it would not be possible to have a division on it. He was most anxious that their claim should be made specially at that point.

*MR. SPEAKER replied that the hon. Member had his division the other day. He had no power to take a division without a discussion.

*MR. J. M. MACDONALD said he wished to move the omission of subsection (2), which laid down the principle upon which the balance of the Education Fund should be allocated. That principle was that the allocation should take place in accordance with a scheme prepared by the Department, and so framed as to give greater aid to those districts with which per head of the population the burden of expenditure on educational purposes, approved by the Department, is excessive as compared with the valuation of the district, which scheme shall be laid before Parliament. He rose to move the rejection of that subsection not because he had any objection to its provisions, but because the scheme which the Secretary for Scotland had introduced was not consistent with the subsection. He went further and held that it was not consistent with the views which the Secretary for Scotland himself put forward in support of it. A model scheme had been presented to the Committee upstairs, illustrating the mode of distribution in accordance with the subsection, and giving the ratios of necessity of the several districts. When subsequently the actual allocation of the money was presented to the Committee, it was found not to correspond with the provisions of the subsection; and the Secretary for Scotland justified the alteration on the ground that, if the allocation were made in accordance with the principles laid down in the subsection, certain districts in Scotland would receive less money than they were actually receiving at the present moment, and also on the ground that those districts were relatively poor. As to the first ground no one would object to a sum being taken from the fund and so distributed as to make the amounts to be given to these districts equal to the amounts they now received. The second ground upon which the right hon. Gentleman justified his departure from the model scheme opened up a much larger question, and it was to that part of the proposal that he should like particularly to draw the attention of the House. In the first place, he contested the view that the districts that would be benefited under the second scheme were the poorer districts, and, in the second place, even if these districts were really the poorer districts, the allocation of the funds gave to them a considerably larger sum than they obtained at the present moment, and gave them that sum at the cost of the rest of the country. The districts that benefited under the scheme represented 38 per cent. of the population of Scotland, and only 36 per cent. of the expenditure and 42 per cent. of the valuation, while the districts adversely affected represented 62 per cent. of the population, 64 per cent. of the expenditure, and only 58 per cent. of the valuation. He contended that those figures proved that the principles laid down in the subsection had been entirely departed from in the allocation which his right hon. friend had actually made of the balance of the fund. Take, for example, the six school boards which came under the allocation; five, which were prejudiced by the scheme, had rates over the average for the whole of Scotland, while the only one that had a rate under the average was benefited. Turning to the ratios of necessity of the several districts, he showed that the allocation was not only not in accordance with them, but in many instances diametrically opposed to them.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) rose to a point of order. His hon. friend said he did not object to the terms of this section, which provided that the money should be divided according to a scheme to be laid before Parliament. There had been two tentative schemes produced, but neither was before Parliament, and neither formed part of this Bill. He was most anxious for this Bill to go through, and why should they waste an hour in discussing a scheme which was not in the Bill.

MR. PIRIE inquired whether it was in order to say it was waste of time to discuss a matter of this kind.

*MR. SPEAKER did not think there was any point of order raised. It was a question of merits.

MR. PIRIE, on a point of order, said the second Order on the Paper, which was to be taken at 8.15 p.m., was not necessarily bound to come on at that time, the Rule being suspended. It could come on later, at eleven o'clock. Therefore, they had illimitable time to discuss this question.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was wrong there. He would only have up to eleven o'clock. The question of the disposal of the time did not rest with him, but with the House itself.

*MR. J. M. MACDONALD said he did not wish to detain the House much longer as he had made his point, and he had no doubt his right hon. friend understood it. They did not object to the principle contained in the subsection, but they did object to the scheme which the right hon. Gentleman had presented to the Committee for the purpose of carrying it out. They recognised that under the principle of the Bill there were certain districts that would suffer, and would receive less money than they received at the present moment. They were willing that these districts should have money temporarily applied to them, so that the amounts they received under this scheme would not be less than those they at present received, but they were not willing that this scheme should be a permanent scheme to be taken as a model for all future schemes. If the right hon. Gentleman would give an assurance that the scheme was temporary in its provisions, and that he would reconsider it with a feeling favourably disposed towards the districts which were necessitous, and which suffered under it, it would not be necessary for him to divide the House on his Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 14, line 18, to leave out subsection (2) of Clause 15."—(*Mr. J. M. Macdonald.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for,' in page 14, line 21, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. COCHRANE said the hon. Member had put clearly before the

House a matter of considerable importance to Scotsmen, the division of the spoils. They had fought Education Bills for many years, and now the fight took place over the division of the spoils. The position had been somewhat complicated by the attitude taken up by the Secretary for Scotland. When the right hon. Gentleman introduced the Bill he issued with it a Memorandum and a draft scheme showing how the money was to be allocated among the various counties. That scheme was examined by the House, and was referred to the various authorities. At the last moment, just before the Bill went to Grand Committee, the scheme was withdrawn, and another substituted for it. Hence these tears. Had the right hon. Gentleman consulted the school boards before instead of after, he might have produced a different scheme altogether. The right hon. Gentleman truly said they could not go on population or valuation alone, that they must be considered together. If to those elements he had added areas he would have done far better, because areas were a very great element of consideration in this matter. The right hon. Gentleman, however, took the two elements of population and valuation, and introduced a scheme, but unfortunately he withdrew that scheme and substituted another in which he entirely departed from those principles, except as to one-third of the fund. He allocated one-third of the fund in proportion to population and valuation, but the other two-thirds he allocated in a purely arbitrary fashion. He himself was quite impartial in this matter, because the constituency which he represented got the same amount under the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman as it would get under the scheme shadowed forth by the hon. Member. He was not, therefore, a searcher after illegitimate spoils. When he regarded the reasons which might have influenced the right hon. Gentleman in departing from his original scheme, he noticed some somewhat sinister points. He noticed that particular districts got more under the amended scheme, and that singular favours had been dealt out to Forfarshire, a district not unconnected with the right hon. Gentleman. Taking Forfarshire and Shetland together, he found the ratio of necessity in the former was 12,763, and in Shetland 6,604, and it was a curious fact that whereas under the original scheme Forfarshire only got £10,000 and poor Shetland £5,000, under the amended scheme the contribution to Forfarshire rose to £14,441, whilst that of poor Shetland fell to £2,500. Peeblesshire, another county not unrepresented in great circles, also received a considerable increase. He was not going to inquire by what fortunate circumstance these things happened. All he wished to do was to ask the right hon. Gentleman to adopt some definite principle. Population was not enough, and valuation was not enough, and therefore if the right hon. Gentleman adopted areas he would be wise, because some arrangement must be made for those large counties where the expense was very great. Rumour said that the right hon. Gentleman was going to make some statement on this matter, and therefore it would be perhaps better not to move the Amendment he had intended to move. The right hon. Gentleman might find it easier to make that statement to his supporters rather than to the Opposition. All he would say was that he hoped in that statement the right hon. Gentleman would shadow forth some principle which people could understand, and that would be fair to all Scotland. He did not like to think that these schemes were altered from time to time in order to give an unfair share of the spoils to a particular district.

*MR. WILKIE (Dundee) pointed out that in the previous week he had put a question to the right hon. Gentleman on the matter now under discussion. But he was informed that the experts on this matter did not acknowledge the correctness of his reply. In his answer the right hon. Gentleman stated that while the proposal was strongly opposed by some, a greater number supported it. That might be so as far as the number of Boards was concerned, but if they took the number of children and people involved in the districts the balance was entirely the other way. The Government set out in their Bill that their object was to help those districts which most needed help, districts where there was large expenditure for education, poor districts unable to pay high rates, but this proposal did the very opposite. Instead of helping the poor urban authorities and the highly rated districts in Scotland it was helping the rich and high valuation districts. What they felt and what they feared, but what they hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to reassure them upon, was that this provision would take from the elementary schools and give to the secondary schools. It used to be the boast of Scotsmen that in the educational system of Scotland there was the opportunity of going to the University from the elementary school, and that there were teachers in the elementary schools able to prepare the scholar for the University. He hoped before this question was decided the Government would be able to assure the House that this provision would work in the entirely opposite direction to what they feared, and that the first idea of the Government would be carried out, and that greater assistance would be given to those districts which needed it most.

*Mr. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.) also objected to the subsection. He did not, he said, intend to go into the details of the first and second schemes except to draw attention to the footnote on this question in the Cd. Paper 4051. He asked hon. Members to look at those words. The words of the subsection were not altered in Committee, and remained in the Bill as when it was originally introduced. He therefore apprehended that these words having been used to cover a principle in the Bill still held good. On the other hand they found that a second allocation was proposed which was totally different, though, as he had pointed out, the words of the Bill remained the same. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to tell them which of these two allocations was, according to the Bill, because they could not both be right, and his second allocation was apparently re-enacting the two grants which were solemnly repealed in Clause 14. Having annulled those grants under Clause 14, it was now proposed to re-enact them, if not for all time, apparently for this time, at any rate. The present allocation said one-third, according to population, multiplied by expenses and divided by valuation. How could that be in accordance with the Bill itself? He held that, from the legal point of view, this could not be correct. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman, in the kindness of his intention, had sought to give everybody a little more. He sympathised with him in that particular, but he could not admit that this proposal was in consonance with the terms of the Bill. Could the right hon. Gentleman explain why they should not reverse the two-thirds according to population and expenses? The position might be reversed by having nine-sixteenths on the one side and seven-sixteenths on the other. The truth was that the method was so arranged as to bring out the desired result. There was no principle here. While he credited the right hon. Gentleman with a kind heart in trying to give everybody a little more, it was not according to the Bill. He desired to call attention to another phase of the matter. The Bill said that this clause was to be "so passed as to give greater aid," etc., he need not trouble to read the terms through again. If they boiled the words down to one phrase, it meant that aid was to be given when expenditure was excessive as compared with valuation. The hon. Member for Ayrshire had referred to Forfarshire; he should like to refer to Perthshire and other counties. In Lanarkshire the expenditure per head from the rates was 9¾d., and in Perthshire it was under 8d. If they compared the valuation they found that in Perthshire it was £9 10s. per head of the population, and in Lanarkshire, £6 10s. Surely, if there was any meaning in the words of the Bill, it should be Lanarkshire which should get more and Perthshire less. The matter appeared to be perfectly clear. By this kind-hearted allocation under which everybody got a little, he would point out that Lanarkshire got £42,000, but if that county got the same allocation per pupil in attendance as Perthshire it would get no less than £49,000 more; if it had the same as Perthshire, it would get £32,000 more; as Forfarshire, £37,000 more; or as Dumfriesshire, £15,000 more. Surely no one could be surprised if they doubted somewhat the legality of the allocation. In answer to a Supplementary Question the other day the right hon. Gentleman said this subject was a complex one. He acknowledged its complexity. He had been studying it for some time, and he thought it more complex than a Chinese puzzle. What with residue grants, secondary school grants, grants under a minute (whatever that might mean), general aid grants, special grants, Gaelic speaking grants, and necessitous school grants, grants according to population, and grants according to school attendance, the whole thing should be put in the melting pot and divided up equally according to the average of scholars in attendance. There were people who were rather amused at those Members who backed up their constituencies, yet they were the people who enlarged on the generosity of the Scottish Education Department to their particular counties. In his humble opinion a great deal of that generosity was at the expense of the industrial communities—at the expense of Lanarkshire, Dumbartonshire, Renfrewshire, and other industrial communities. Lanarkshire was the premier county of Scotland. [" Oh, oh."] Well whether it was or not, it had nearly one-eighth of the whole population and it got less than one-tenth of the grant. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether that appeared to him to be a fair allocation. Lanarkshire had an average attendance of 88,000 out of a total of 720,000 for the whole of Scotland. In the continuation classes of Lanarkshire, they had 14,310 scholars, and had one-seventh of the whole in that particular. In Lanarkshire they had 2,000 children attending higher grade schools out of 18,000 for all Scotland; and they spent in rates £5,878, out of a total for Scotland of £37,000. Lanarkshire, therefore, by these details, showed that it was not only in population, in scholars and attendance the premier county of Scotland, but also in the amount it paid for education. In his opinion, the continuation classes were a most important method of education in the community, and ought to be particularly encouraged. He would perhaps be excused for referring to his own constituency. Hon. Members travelling from Glasgow or Edinburgh would remember a long stretch of hill and dale, mountain and valley, between Carstairs and the summit. It was as thinly a populated district as was to be found anywhere in Scotland. Indeed, before this Bill was introduced, he had put before the Education Department a proposal to be allowed to drive children to school in conveyances, so great were the distances they had to go. Though the children had to travel great distances to school in South Lanarkshire, yet they got only 9s. 7d. per pupil in attendance, as compared with 17s. 4d. in a neighbouring county. In his county the highest point was at the village of Leadhills, where they got 9s. 7d., while at the highest point in Dumfries, Wanlockhead, they got 13s. 1d. For twenty or thirty miles Lanarkshire marched with Dumfries; there was no climatic difference, no river, no range of mountains, only an imaginary dividing line, on one side of which they gave 9s. 7d. and on the other, 13s. 1d. On its other side, Lanarkshire marched twenty or thirty miles with Peebleshire, where again there was no climatic difference, no river, no range of mountains, only an imaginary line, on one side of which they paid 9s. 7d. and on the other 20s. 9d. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why?] He did not know; he was asking for information. The right hon. Gentleman said the matter was complex. He had inquired into this subject, and he had read the big report of about 1,000 pages as well as he could, and he could find no reason why Lanarkshire, particularly in the thinly populated portion of it which he represented, should get 9s. 7d., while Peebles got 20s. 9. It might be that he had approached the subject from a personal point of view in connection with his constituency, but if a man could not speak for his own constituency, whatever constituency was he to speak for? He asked the right hon. Gentleman to give this aspect of the question his serious consideration, and give them some reasons why the money was so divided.

MR. SINCLAIR said the hon. Gentleman had given them the particulars and circumstances of his own constituency, and it was, of course, the case that that part of Lanarkshire which he represented was dissimilar in character from the rest of the county in a very marked degree.

Under the power which at present existed, and which was given by Parliament, it was quite possible to reconstitute at some later date the district committees which were entrusted with the distribution of these funds, and it would be quite possible to consider whether the special circumstances of a district such as South Lanarkshire were not of sufficient magnitude to justify the creation of a special district committee for that special district. In the meantime they had to deal with the machinery at present in operation in Scotland, and he was asked to say a word on a scheme of distribution which had been put forward as likely to be adopted under this Bill. He asked the House to note that the scheme itself did not form part of this clause. They had had a very full discussion of the matter in Committee. He would not quarrel with the narration which had been given of the discussions or of the actions of the Government in this respect in regard to the two different illustrative proposals which had been put before the Scottish Members of the Grand Committee. Let it be noted also, that after a very full examination no new circumstance had been put before the House which was not present to the Committee, except possibly some local characteristics of the hon. Gentleman's own constituency.

MR. J. M. MACDONALD: I think my right hon. friend is wrong. It is our contention that the districts benefited are not necessitous in the sense in which they were said to be necessitous when the scheme was before the Committee.

MR. SINCLAIR said that might be the hon. Member's contention, but the facts were before the Committee. The hon. Gentleman might not take the view of the facts which the Government did, but the facts were there for him to judge of just as he could judge of them now. After very full discussion the Committee accepted the scheme of the Government unanimously. It was perfectly obvious to the Committee that the distribution of money on the first principle was absolutely impossible, and any scheme which deprived the existing local authorities of their present resources, and obliged them to curtail the education they were giving, possibly to shut up schools or to discontinue classes, was quite impossible of acceptance. Local authorities in the first place had undertaken obligations to provide certain facilities for education. It was quite impossible that Parliament should step in and take away from them the resources upon which those facilities rested. If it was a good thing to do educationally there would be very strong Parliamentary opposition to it, and quite rightly in his opinion, because it would be a very false educational standard. Therefore, any scheme which did not guarantee to existing local authorities the resources which they at present employed for education was out of the question. That obliged them to curtail the application of the principle mentioned in the clause, because that was a full application of the principle to the whole sum at their disposal. Therefore they were obliged to modify, as he thought was the practical common-sense view of it, the application of the principle of the Bill, and instead of applying that principle to the whole sum they applied it to only a part of the sum. They applied the remaining part of the money exactly on the principle which one hon. Member had quoted, and which would be applied in respect of average attendance, or, what was much the same thing, to the population of the district. They went very far to meet their few critics. They still maintained by their scheme the application to a part of this money of the principle contained in the subsection. They were bound to do that. It was proper to do it from an educational point of view to aid the poorer districts. This money was obtained from the Treasury on the understanding that the money was wanted to develop education in the poorer districts of the country. The scheme of distribution had been announced, but it was not in its final form. Provision was made in this very paragraph of the Bill for the publication from time to time of a Minute setting forth the scheme of distribution of money available to this Education (Scotland) Fund. The first Minute would appear as soon as they knew the sums available under these various grants next year. They were obliged to be sure of the amounts which would become due and payable under the grants next year before they could draw up the Minute. That delay gave a margin of time for consideration. He gave the assurance in the most clear and distinct terms that they were perfectly ready to consider any views and suggestions and proposals which were made to them between now and the time when the Minute had to be published provided these proposed modifications secured to each local authority not less money than they got at present, and that they secured for their proposals greater general assent than was secured by the scheme as it at present stood.

*MR. PIRIE said that to a certain extent perhaps the House might consider the statement of the right hon. Gentleman satisfactory, but he expressed regret that he did not hold out some hope of modification at an earlier stage. At the last moment they were told the scheme was not absolutely final.

MR. SINCLAIR: It never was final in that sense.

*MR. PIRIE said it was not generally understood so. That just showed the terrible danger, which every Scottish member must realise existed in the proceedings of the Scottish Committee, which were not known or realised in Scotland; so much so, that two deputations had waited on the right hon. Gentleman quite lately from educational authorities in Scotland directly opposed to this allocation, which they considered as intended to be final. He had met a member of the last deputation on its return to Scotland, and heard that all they obtained was a direct refusal, that there was no argument, and that the Secretary for Scotland talked round the question quite apart from meeting it in argument, and they went back more forlorn than when they came. It must be clearly understood that within a reasonable time they should have an opportunity of discussing the Minute which the right hon. Gentleman now promised, and that the Education Vote, not the salary of the Secretary for Scotland, should come on the first of Scottish Estimates next year. He had to regret that the second scheme of the right hon. Gentleman did not secure the desired result, but before passing from it there were peculiarities, some of which had already been referred to, which deserved to be brought before the people of Scotland. It was only in that House on Report that they had any chance at all of speaking to the people of Scotland, and he refused to have his time restricted by threats that the Bill would not be passed. The result of the second allocation was lucky for certain constituencies, but unlucky for others, and though he did not in any way allude to the results as being in any way desired results, as another hon. Member had done, he did characterise them as regrettable and unsatisfactory. The Secretary for War was a great educational authority. He had wanted to discuss his views on Scottish education before now, but he had not had a chance. He hoped to have it on the Third Reading. But anyhow Haddington was to receive under the first allocation, £2,800. Under the second scheme it received £4,300. Perthshire, also represented by a front bench Member, was to receive £8,800, and it now received £14,600. Roxburgh was to receive £2,800 under the first scheme and £5,400 under the second. Edinburgh, which was closely allied by official connection with the hon. and learned Gentleman who represented parts of Roxburghshire, received £6,000 more under the new scheme than under the old. Such a state of things ought never to have been introduced except on a basis of clear principle laid down beforehand, and they were not doing their duty unless they took every opportunity of showing the people of Scotland that such a proposition was wrong. They wanted to have a radical change, and make sure that they would have their rights, and that they would have full discussion, and not a hole-and-corner discussion such as they had had in Committee, with no reporters and half the Members away on other Committees and other official duties. The right hon. Gentleman claimed that they as the House should not reverse the decision of the Scottish Committee. He was a strong advocate of the creation of these Scottish Committees on certain lines, but it was an evil day for Scotland——

*MR. SPEAKER: This is quite beside the mark.

*Mr. PIRIE said he only brought it forward in answer to the argument of the Secretary for Scotland that it was settled by the Scottish Committee and that the House should have nothing more to do with it. He did not think it was necessary for his hon. friend to go to a division, because there were only about fifty or sixty Members present, although 200 or 300 hon. Members would come trooping in at the sound of the division bell and would vote according to the order of the Government Whips without knowing what had taken place in the debate. Therefore he would ask the hon. Member who moved this Amendment to be satisfied if he could get an assurance that this matter would be brought up on the Scottish Estimates.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said that before the Amendment was withdrawn he should like to have it clearly stated whether he was right in assuming that this was not in any sense of the word a permanent scheme. Were they to understand that, apart from the necessity of safeguarding the various district authorities in regard to spending, no other vested interest was going to be acquired under this scheme?

Mr. SINCLAIR said that followed from what he had said.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that no new matter had been imported since they discussed this question in Committee, and that it was a blessed thing to have a principle to work upon.

Mr. SINCLAIR said he did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that there was a great deal of advantage in working on a principle. When the Committee came to a decision upon this scheme, it was largely the direct result of the speech which the Lord Advocate made, and in the course of that speech, in advocating the second scheme, he said he did so—

"in order to help densely-populated places where there was not a large valuation. The object was to get hold of the necessitous districts and relieve the populous districts which needed a great deal of money but which could not levy rates because they were so high already."

Since then, hon. Members had had an opportunity of going into the facts, and as regarded the districts which benefited under the scheme, out of twenty-two, eighteen, or 80 per cent, were not necessitous districts but areas where the school rate at the present moment was under the average for Scotland. In only four districts was the rate over the average, and in none was it more than about a halfpenny over the average for Scotland. Taking the districts which were prejudicially affected, of the whole seventeen no less than eleven, or 64 per cent., had got school rates in excess of the average for Scotland, and in some cases the rate was so high that it was something over 4½d. He thought it was time to revise the ideas upon which they arrived at a state of acquiescence in this scheme. If they worked out the figures they would find that these proposals would not hold water. The scheme might be justifiable from the point of view of expediency, but from the point of view of principle it was impossible to justify it. This scheme was so illogical that some districts where they had a high valuation, a low rate, and a small population would get more than districts in which they had a low valuation and a high rate and a large population. Any scheme which gave such results as those was illogical and could not be permanent. In fact, from the point of view of principle the system was entirely indefensible.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON invited hon. Members whose constituencies would get large grants to exercise a little forbearance with those districts which would suffer under this distribution. Although it was quite true that the distribution was not final, everyone admitted that it was one which was very powerfully supported by his right hon. friend and other promoters of the Bill. It seemed difficult to see how it could be modified or altered, so thoroughly had it been considered, and so impossible was it to reduce the allowance already given. He was not at all sure that with respect to the necessitous allowances to some educational authorities there should not be some reduction of the amount given. He did not admit that that was impossible. He had known cases where the education grants were excessive as compared with what other education districts were receiving, and in such cases it was just to reduce those grants. It was indeed one of the things perpetuated under this Bill that there would continue to be an unequal incidence of the education rate. Therefore, this clause dealing with the distribution ought to be recast. The principle laid down was an admirable one, and they were all carried away with it on the Committee, but when it was said that no new facts had been elicited, he did not agree with that statement. Many facts had been elicited, not only since the Bill was in Committee, but since it had entered upon the Report stage. This scheme could never stand. He was not raising the question of his own constituency in comparison with Edinburgh, because the result was sufficiently obvious, but on the general principle laid down, and taking the general results, they were not only entirely antagonistic to the principle, but they would never be accepted by the majority of the people of Scotland. He did not think that much further discussion was required, because the Government had to reckon not with the House of Commons but with the constituencies in this matter, and they would insist upon a fair distribution in consonance with the general principles which had been laid down. Those principles could not be improved upon, but the principle of this distribution might be summed up in the words: "To him that hath shall be given even more abundantly." That was a principle which would not be popular in Scotland, and would not be accepted in this Bill.

*MR. J. M. MACDONALD thought it would be for the convenience of the House if he withdrew his Amendment. He accepted the assurances given by the Secretary for Scotland, and he begged leave to withdraw.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. MENZIES moved to leave out from the words "the districts" to the end of the clause, and to insert the words "so as to give an equal amount, for every child in average attendance at their respective school or schools, to all school boards and other managers of State-aided schools, but that only after reservation of the sum of £25,000 to be given, at the absolute discretion of the Department, to necessitous schools or schools in thinly populated districts." This Bill proposed an unequal distribution of the money. He had no doubt whatever that the Secretary for Scotland and his draftsmen could draw up something better than the words of his Amendment, but he would be quite satisfied if he could get the substance of his proposal adopted by the Government. He had placed the sum at £25,000 for the necessitous schools, but if the Government suggested £26,000 or £27,000 or even £23,000 he would be quite agreeable to accept such a proposal. They could not change all the anomalies of the distribution which had been going on for years, and they could not abolish those anomalies without hurting somebody. Those districts were treated generously by the Department at the expense of the other districts, which only got about half. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would give this scheme of equality some consideration. He was quite willing to accept the words of the Amendment of which the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire had given notice. He begged to move.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire) in seconding the Amendment, said it seemed to him that some clear directions from the House ought to be given as to the principle on which such a large sum of money should be distributed, and that it should not be left to the sweet will of the Department. The Department had put forward a scheme which seemed to rest on no clear principle whatever. He would not quarrel with it if it worked well, but his point was that it did not work well. For example, Kincardineshire got at the rate of 15s. and Peeblesshire over 20s. per child in average attendance, while the industrial counties of Lanark, Renfrew, and Dumbarton got under 10s. per child in average attendance. It seemed to him that these industrial centres, in many places overcrowded, ought to receive much fairer and more generous treatment than they were receiving under the scheme. The scheme which he and his friends were putting forward was that the number of children in average attendance at the schools should be subject to two qualifications. The first was that £25,000 a year should be set aside for specially necessitous districts, and the other was that no district should receive less than it was at present receiving, subject to the general qualification that the arrangement was sound in principle and would work well in practice.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 21, to leave out from the word 'district,' to end of clause, and to insert the words, 'so as to give an equal amount, for every child in average attendance at their respective school or schools, to all school boards and other managers of State-aided schools, but that only after reservation of the sum of twenty-five thousand pounds to be given, at the absolute discretion of the Department, to necessitous schools or schools in thinly-populated districts.'"—(*Mr. Menzies.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'in,' in line 24, stand part of the Bill.'"

Mr. SINCLAIR said the local authorities were, under the Bill, to get their share of the grant not as charity but of right. The hon. Member proposed to reserve £25,000. He himself was perfectly confident that such a distribution would not be in accordance with the general desire of the people of Scotland. What the local authorities wanted was to know what they would be sure to get, and not to be under the apprehension that, having the right to certain moneys, they could not depend upon them in future. That was an insuperable objection to accepting the Amendment. All these suggestions were fully examined and considered. He appealed to his hon. friend not to press the Amendment. The views of Members representing various constituencies were before the Government, and they would be carefully considered.

Mr. MENZIES said that on the understanding that this would receive consideration he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. MORTON who had an Amendment on the Paper to leave out the words, "in accordance with a scheme of allocation prepared by the Department," and to insert the words, "a fixed grant to be allocated to each county in the first place, the balance to be distributed according to population or in some other equitable manner," said that Sutherland was one of the counties which apparently under all the scales would suffer a diminution of what they at present earned. He understood from the right hon. Gentleman that the Department would not be bound by the scale mentioned and that in no case would they get less money than they were getting this current year, and that in all human probability, they must get more, as there would be more money to distribute. Under those circumstances, and being anxious that the Bill should be passed, he did not desire to move this Amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON moved an Amendment which, he said, was designed to give something of a safeguard in the matter referred to by the hon. Member for Aberdeen.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, lines 29 and 30, to leave out the words 'which scheme shall be laid before Parliament,' and to insert the words 'Provided that such scheme shall be forthwith laid before both Houses of Parliament if Parliament be sitting, or, if not, then within three weeks after the commencement of the next ensuing session of Parliament, and if neither House of Parliament within one month, exclusive of any period of prorogation, after a scheme has been laid before it, presents an address praying the King to withhold his assent from such scheme or any part thereof, it shall be lawful for the King in Council by Order to approve the same or any part thereof to which such address does not relate. The presentation of an address as aforesaid shall be without prejudice to the making of a further scheme under the like procedure. (4) A scheme under this section may be amended by a subsequent scheme made under the like procedure. (5) Any scheme approved by Order in Council under this section shall, as from the date prescribed in such Order, be of the same force as if it were enacted in this Act.'"—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 14, line 40, after the word 'parents,' to insert the words ' or guardians.' "

"In page 15, line 9, to leave out from the word 'of,' to end of line 10, and to insert the words 'income from all sources other than from school rate.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON rose to move, in page 15, line 9, to leave out from the word "income," to end of subsection, and insert the words "from fees and from grants made by the Department, which grants shall be paid on the annual average attendance of all scholars enrolled in these schools, provided that a course approved by the Department is followed by the majority of the pupils and that a full and definite course of secondary education is substituted for such as do not follow it."

MR. SINCLAIR asked whether the Amendment was in order. It was an instruction as to the disposal of a Treasury Grant, which did not come out of the Scottish fund at all.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think that is so. We cannot deal with that on Report.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON moved to insert, at the end of line 10, the words "except burghs and parishes which have made provision for their own scholars." He said the Amendment referred to an educational hardship which would result from the clause as it stood. Some Leith children went to Edinburgh High School, at a cost of £10 to £12 per head, and others went to Trinity Academy, at a cost of less than £3 per head. It seemed to him rather hard that the cost of children belonging to parents with social aspirations who attended Edinburgh High School, which had great educational traditions, should fall upon the poorer population of Leith, possibly dock labourers out of employment. Why should they have to contribute towards the cost of the education of the Leith child at the Edinburgh High School, amounting to between £10 and £12 in the course of the year? It was hard that they should have to pay for that child four times what the cost would be at Trinity Academy.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 15, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'except burghs and parishes which have made provision for their own scholars.' "—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said that under the whole system of education in Scotland parents could not be compelled to send their children to any particular school. There was no such obligation in any preceding Education Act. The grievance to which reference had been made was not so bad as the hon. Gentleman made out. The cost of secondary education did not fall on the rates; it was provided for from other funds. In the second place, by this Bill, as his hon. friend knew, the burden of secondary education was laid not upon a particular parish, but on the district as a whole by a system of contributions from the school boards of outside districts which sent some children to the secondary school, and by the provision of bursaries. He hoped his hon. friend would not press his Amendment.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said he would not press the Amendment, but as the people of Leith found that they would have a hard case under the Bill he had brought it up.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 15, line 20, to leave out the word 'fund,' and to insert the word 'board.' "

"In page 15, line 21, after the word 'maintenance,' to insert the words 'after deduction of income from grants made by the Department or from fees, and of any sum paid to the school board under the immediately preceding subsection.' "

"In page 16, line 21, after the word 'aforesaid,' to insert the words 'or, in circumstances approved by the Department, at a supplementary course of not less than three years duration conducted in accordance with Article 21 of the Code of regulations for day schools of 1908 or under other regulations of the Department that may come in place thereof.' "

"In page 16, line 23, at end, to insert the words 'or training college.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

*MR. COCHRANE said that the Amendment standing in his name to insert in Clause 16, after the word "board" the words "or the managers of any inspected school," was to meet another special case, that of Spier's School at Beith. That school was made a central institution for the training of junior students by the Scottish Education Department. It was governed by a body of eleven managers, of whom seven were elected by the school boards of the district, and these were called upon by the Department to increase their accommodation in order that they might receive the additional grant. The managers spent £4,500 in providing an admirable science and art equipment; and what they desired was that there should be some power by which this school, and others similarly situated, should get back some part of the capital expenditure on equipment in the same way as by subsecttion (8) of the clause school boards got contributions in aid of capital expenditure for class-rooms, laboratories, etc. He thought an economic way of providing for this class of education should be encouraged, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman could see his way to add these words to the clause.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 26, after the word 'board,' to insert the words "or the managers of any inspected school.'"—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said he had no doubt that Spier's School was doing most excellent work, but the difficulty of accepting the Amendment was that it would give a grant-in-aid of capital expenditure to increase the value of property held by private persons. He was sorry that that was a principle to which it was not possible to assent.

*MR. COCHRANE said that the right hon. Gentleman misapprehended the case. There were eleven governors of this school, only one of whom was nominated and eleven were elected by school boards.

MR. SINCLAIR said he did not quite follow the hon. Gentleman. There might be a large share of representation in the management of the school, but that did not alter the fact that the Amendment would involve the making of a grant-in-aid of capital expenditure on what was private property.

Amendment negatived.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) moved to add to the end of subsection (1) of Clause 20 the words: "Provided always that it shall not be competent under this section to annex a school board district having a population of over fifty thousand to an adjacent school board district unless the districts concerned are agreed in desiring such union." The object of this Amendment was to prevent the abuse of the system by which a school board might induce the Department to annex an adjacent school board against the wish of the latter. He represented a school board district with a population of 250,000 which had shown a progressive spirit ever since its establishment in 1872. Their school board was admitted to be one of the best in Scotland and they naturally wished to be safeguarded against a possible arbitrary Order from the Department to be united with the School Board of Glasgow. Unless both the school boards desired to be united it should not be done. He begged to move.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) seconded the Amendment, which, he said, limited the power of the Department and made it essential that before one school board could annex another that adjacent board should give its consent. Large districts were apt to swallow up the small fry of neighbouring districts, as the city of Edinburgh had repeatedly endeavoured to swallow up Leith, and Glasgow, Govan.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 19, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided always that it shall not be competent under this section to annex a school board district having a population of over fifty thousand to an adjacent school board district unless the districts concerned are agreed in desiring such union.'"—(*Mr. Robert Duncan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said that this Amendment really only applied to Govan and he did not think that Govan would like to be called small fry, as had been suggested by the seconder. He could assure the hon. Member for Govan that he need have no apprehension in regard to the Govan School Board being united to the Glasgow district. He thought it would be undesirable specially to safeguard in a Bill of this kind a very large district such as Govan, which was perfectly able to take care of itself.

MR. R. DUNCAN said as the right hon. Gentleman and the Government had satisfied themselves on this matter, it would be captious on his part not to accept the explanations. He would withdraw the Amendment.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) asked whether, in the case of the absorption of one school board by another under this clause, there were any safeguards as to the emoluments, etc., of the officials of the absorbed school board.

MR. SINCLAIR said an hon. Member had an Amendment down on that point, and the question had better be discussed upon it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SINCLAIR, speaking in regard to an Amendment which stood on the Paper in the name of Mr. Cochrane, safeguarding the interests of the officials of the school boards in the event of an order uniting them being made, said that in the opinion of his advisers these officials were provided for, but he would reconsider the matter, as he desired to act in the spirit of the lines of the Amendment, and if it was necessary he would introduce a further provision.

MR. COCHRANE said that, of course, after the right hon. Gentleman's speech, he should not move the Amendment, but he would rather like the right hon. Gentleman to say how he proposed to give effect to his promise. There was a power in the Bill to unite parishes and officials might be displaced. He had not been able to ascertain whether anything would be done for them, and he, therefore, put down this Amendment, which he had taken from the Local Government Act of 1889, adjusting it to meet the needs of the various classes. He thought some similar clause should be put in to safeguard the rights of the teachers. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman was thoroughly seized of the point, and wished he had been able to put the Amendment down sooner, so that he might have been able to consider it.

MR. SINCLAIR said he should like to have a free hand as to the way in which he dealt with the question if it was necessary. At present he was advised it was not necessary. Passing from that subject, he wished to move an Amendment omitting subsection (2) and introducing another dealing with the question of audit. A good deal of discussion, he said, had taken place on that subject since the Committee stage of the Bill, and therefore he proposed his Amendment which was now upon the Paper. The first Amendment which appeared on the Paper was that in the name of the hon. Member for North Ayrshire. That Amendment was very long, and practically restated the system which they had embodied in the Bill, by transferring a large portion of the Schedule into the actual substance of the Bill, and it provided for an appeal to the Court of Session, which was to be an appeal by a person aggrieved by the surcharge. The Government were very anxious to meet all reasonable criticism to their proposal. The House would see that there were Amendments down in the name of the hon. Member for Falkirk Burghs to this Amendment of the hon. Member for North Ayrshire, and the real substantive portion of the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Falkirk Burghs lay in the paragraph which dealt with the question of surcharge. The hon. Member proposed to insert—

"And in the event of any expenditure of the same nature as the payment so disallowed being incurred by the school board in any subsequent year, the Department if they shall be of opinion that the members authorising such expenditure should be surcharged, may present a petition to either division of the Court of Session, craving to have such expenditure declared illegal, and the said members of the school board ordained to refund the amount of such expenditure in the event of it being declared illegal, and the Court shall before granting or refusing the prayer of such petition consider any representations made in answer thereto by the members proposed to be surcharged, and the Court shall have power to find that the expenses of said proceedings shall be payable by said members personally or out of the school fund as may appear just."

His hon. friend proposed that the Government should make it perfectly clear and explicit that there should be a dispensing power in the Department in regard to a first offence, so to speak, or the first illegal expenditure, and, as he himself said in Committee, frequently an expenditure of this kind might be incurred perfectly innocently, without any *mala fides* in the matter, and it had never been the practice of the Department to disallow any such payment. The hon. Member for Falkirk Burghs made this perfectly explicit in the Amendment which he had introduced to the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Ayrshire. That was his first point. His second point was that the Department should not have the power to surcharge itself, but if it wished to surcharge, it must go to the Court of Session, thereby laying the burden of determining upon that Court. The Department would have to go to the Court of Session and get the sanction of that Court to surcharge. He had had opportunities of consulting various bodies of critics of the original proposals of the Government as they were now contained in the Bill, on the subject of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Falkirk Burghs, and he had received assurances from them that the hon. Gentleman's proposal as amending that of the hon. Member for North Ayrshire met their views sufficiently, and thus bearing in mind the point of view of the Department, and the point of view of Scottish education, he had put down in his own name the Amendment which he now moved. It appeared a very long Amendment, but it was simply an embodiment of what the two hon. Gentleman he had mentioned just now proposed, and made one consistent Amendment, and showed the scheme of audit and surcharge which the Government now proposed to the Committee. He thought he need not say anything more at the moment to explain further that system, but he hoped, as there was good ground for believing, that it met with approval outside the House, it might be equally fortunate to meet with approval inside it. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 7, to leave out subsection (2) and to insert the following: (2) The following regulations with respect to audit shall be observed (that is to say) (*a*) Before each audit the clerk of the school board shall, after receiving from the accountant of the Department the requisite appointment, give at least fourteen days notice in such manner as shall be prescribed from time to time, of the time and place at which the audit will be made, and of the deposit of accounts required by this section, and of the name and address of the accountant of the Department; (*b*) An abstract in duplicate of the accounts, duly made up, balanced, and signed as aforesaid, shall, together with all assessment books, account books, deeds, contracts, accounts, vouchers, and receipts mentioned or referred to in such accounts, be deposited in the offices of the school board and be open between the hours of eleven forenoon and three afternoon to the inspection of all ratepayers within the district of the school board liable to contribute to the school fund, as hereinbefore provided, for seven clear days before the audit, and all such persons shall be at liberty to take copies of or extcrats from the same, without any fee; and any officer of the school board duly appointed in that behalf refusing to allow inspection thereof shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds. (*c*) For the purpose of any audit under this Act the accountant of the Department may, by demand in writing, require the production before him of all books, deeds, contracts, accounts, vouchers, receipts, and other documents and papers which he may deem necessary, and may require any person holding the same, or accountable therefor, to appear before him at any such audit, or any adjournment thereof, and to make and sign a declaration as to the correctness of the same; and if such person neglects or refuses so to appear, or to produce any such books, deeds, contracts, accounts, vouchers, receipts, documents, or papers, or to make or sign such declaration, he shall incur for every neglect or refusal a penalty not exceeding forty shillings; and if he falsely or corruptly makes or signs any such declaration, knowing the same to be untrue in any material particular, he shall be liable to the penalties inflicted on persons guilty of perjury. (*d*) Any ratepayer may make any objection to such accounts or any part thereof, and shall transmit the same and the grounds thereof in writing to the accountant of the Department, and a copy thereof to the officer concerned, two clear days before the time fixed for the audit, and any ratepayer may be present at the audit and may support any objection made as hereinbefore provided either by himself or by any ratepayer. (*e*) If it shall appear to the accountant of the Department acting in pursuance of this section that any payment is in his opinion contrary to law and should be disallowed, or that any sum which in his opinion ought to have been, is not brought into account by any person, whether such payment or failure to account has been made matter of objection or not, he shall, by an Interim Report under his hand, report thereon to the Department setting forth the grounds of his opinion as aforesaid, and the Department shall cause such Interim Report to be intimated to the objector, if any, and to the officer or other person affected thereby; and after due inquiry the Department shall decide all questions raised by such Interim Report, and shall disallow all illegal payments, and shall allow all sums which ought to have been but have not been brought into account, and, in the event of any expenditure, of the same nature as any payment so disallowed being incurred by the school board in any subsequent year, the Department, if they should be of opinion that the members authorising such expenditure should be surcharged, may present a petition to either Division of the Court of Session craving to have such expenditure declared illegal and the said members of the school board ordained to refund the amount of such expenditure in the event of it being declared illegal; and the Court shall, before granting or refusing the prayer of such petition, consider any representations made in answer thereto by the members proposed to be surcharged, and the Court shall have power to find that the expenses of the said proceedings shall be payable by the said members personally or out of the school fund as may appear just. (*f*) Within fourteen days after the completion of the audit, or, as the case may be, after any proceedings under the immediately preceding paragraph of this subsection have been disposed of, the accountant of the Department shall report on the accounts audited, and shall certify on each duplicate abstract thereof the amount in words at length of the expenditure so audited and allowed, and further that the regulations with respect to the accounts have been complied with, and that he hase ascertained by the audit the correctness of the accounts. He shall forthwith send one duplicate abstract of the accounts hereinbefore mentioned to the school board, who shall cause the same to be deposited in their office, and shall publish such abstract in the form prescribed in some one or more of the newspapers circulating in the district of the school board. The accountant of the Department shall also forthwith send the other duplicate abstract of the accounts so certified by him to the Department. Provided that, if the Secretary for Scotland shall so determine, such abstract may come in place of and render unnecessary a return of the receipts and expenditure of the school board in pursuance of the Local Taxation Returns (Scotland) Act, 1881. (*g*) Where any surcharge has been made as hereinbefore provided, or the accountant of the Department has made any interim Report or Report respecting the accounts or the receipts and expenses of the school board, the school board shall cause the surcharge and Interim Report or Report to be printed and published together with the abstract of their accounts hereinbefore mentioned, and to be delivered to any ratepayer, as in this section mentioned, who asks for the same, and in case of default in such publication the Department may cause the same to be published, and the cost of such publication, to the amount certified by the Department, shall be a debt due from the school board to His Majesty, and the clerk of the school board shall be liable in case of default in such publication to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds. (*h*) Notwithstanding any thing in this section the Department may by minute prescribe rules modifying any enactment contained in this subsection as to the time and place of audit.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. COCHRANE said that his Amendment had been upon the Paper for some considerable time and he certainly felt somewhat prejudiced by the attitude adopted by the right hon. Gentleman. The Amendment which he had put down would have been very conveniently discussed had it been taken in its original form and the Amendments on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Falkirk Burghs could then have been discussed on their merits. But the right hon. Gentleman had taken a course which he occasionally adopted; he had thought fit to adopt his Amendment and put down one of his own which had precedence, and prevented him from discussing his own proposal. That, however, was merely a trifling matter and he had to deal with the substance of the proposal. No doubt, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, his Amendment was somewhat lengthy, but the same criticism applied to that of the right hon. Gentleman. He put down his proposal because he desired that the Bill should be intelligible to the ordinary person, but the Bill as drafted by the right hon. Gentleman referred to the Local Government Act of 1889, and then other words were substituted for the words of that statute. That was a very clumsy and confusing way of carrying out the proposal, and he thought he would embody a clause in the Bill so that "he who runs may read." That was the only answer he would make to the right hon. Gentleman's statement that his Amendment was somewhat lengthy. When they came to the substance of the two proposals he preferred his solution to that of the right hon. Gentleman's. In the first place they wanted to safeguard the *bona fide* school board, who would have many difficulties under this Bill. He wanted the House to see that the Department should give them that assistance which they were entitled to claim, so that when some new expenditure arose they would know how to keep in the right path. He had put down another Amendment on line 30 to which he wished to allude as part of his speech. That provided that any particular board or any member who was anxious to know whether they might incur an expenditure might apply to the accountant of the Department, and if he said it was legal no surcharge would arise. That he thought was a commonsense, wise provision. He had not mentioned the Secretary for Scotland as the official of whom the inquiry should be made, because if the right hon. Gentleman was to be the authority to determine the question, and there was an appeal through him to the Court of Session, such a course would have placed him in rather an impossible position, so he was obliged to make the person who would give the opinion whether it was or was not illegal, the accountant of the Department. If he declared that it was illegal it was then provided that the person interested might appeal either to the Court of Session or to the Secretary for Scotland. He thought that was a very complete scheme. What they wanted to prevent was misappropriation and illegal payments, but where a *bona fide* mistake was made they wished that there should be this dispensing power on the part of the Secretary for Scotland. The right hon Gentleman dealt with this matter by leaving out certain words and saying: "There shall be no surcharge on the first illegal" payment. That seemed to him rather to encourage illegal payments. How did the right hon. Gentleman justify his proposition? The first payment might be for a very large amount, but he condoned that offence. Such a way of dealing with the matter opened the door to a very undesirable state of things, nor was it consistent with the other parts of the clause. Because in Section (*d*) it said—

> "Any ratepayer may make any objection to such accounts or any part thereof."

What object could there be in the objection if there was to be no surcharge?

MR. SINCLAIR said the Department had no power to surcharge at present, it had only power to disallow certain expenditure. In future they would have power.

*MR. COCHRANE said that at present the ratepayers might call attention to illegal payments, and there might be a surcharge but under this proposed clause, they might object to the payments, but could do nothing further. What was to take place after the objection? Here again the right hon. Gentleman had placed his Department in a difficult position. There was no surcharge on the first illegal payment. What was to happen on the second? The accountant of the right hon. Gentleman having already declared a payment to be illegal the right hon. Gentleman had to go to law to see if his accountant's opinion was right or not. The right hon. Gentleman had not improved his Bill by this clause. On the other hand, the Amendment which he himself had placed upon the Paper had the sanction of considerable precedent. It was adopted under the Act of 1902 in England, a most masterly work, which had adopted it from the Public Health Act of 1875. Under that provision any aggrieved persons who considered they had been unjustly surcharged, might appeal to the Queen's Bench Division, or to the Local Government Board. They nearly always appealed to the Local Government Board, because that Department had a power of dispensation. His Amendment would give the appeal to the Court of Session or the Secretary for Scotland, and the only objection he had heard to the appeal was on the ground of expense. But any aggrieved school board that desired to avoid expense had only to appeal to the Secretary for Scotland, and if the right hon. Gentleman thought the payment one that might be justified, he could dispense with the surcharge. He ventured to think his proposal met the situation, and that the right hon. Gentleman's was far from meeting it. He was placed in a somewhat awkward position, because with a great deal of the right hon. Gentleman's clause he agreed, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman's method of getting out of the difficulty of the audit was the least possible one that could be devised.

*SIR GEORGE McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) did not, having regard to the compromise offered by the right hon. Gentleman, intend to move his Amendment. At the same time he thought it would have been much better if the right hon. Gentleman had accepted the Amendment adopting the Town Council Act of 1900, on the ground of uniformity. He was now laying down a new procedure with regard to audit. The Report of the Committee on Municipal Trading, presided over by Lord Crewe, laid it down that a surcharge was no protection, and in his view it was better to leave the matter to public opinion and the Law Courts than to attempt to enforce it in this way.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said the question of the surcharge was one he supported strongly in Committee, and the school boards with which he was connected had agreed to his supporting the right hon. Gentleman in this matter, subject to there being an appeal of some kind against the autocratic power of the Department. He agreed that there should be an alternative appeal, but at the same time he thought the appeal to the Court of Session was too expensive. He, as a school board manager, would be much more satisfied in ordinary cases to take his appeal to the right hon. Gentleman than to the Court of Session or any other Court. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept some Amendment to provide for an appeal. He had grave doubts as to the dispensing power which the right hon. Gentleman took. He believed it would take away the rights of the ratepayers of taking legal remedies. It was extremely unwise to put a power of this kind into an Act of Parliament and prevent the rights of ratepayers being exercised. Those rights ought to be protected.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am advised it does not take away those rights, and it is the intention of the Government that it shall not do so. It is our intention to affirm that more clearly.

MR. YOUNGER said if that was so he would pursue that point no further. There was one other objection. The first offence was condoned; and the second offence was to be surcharged. If the first offence was the supply of luncheons, and the second the supply of dinners, they were not the same offence. Were the first and second offences to be of a like character, or were they not? That was a matter the right hon. Gentleman ought to consider. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for having afforded him an opportunity of justifying the action that he had taken, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would allow an alternative appeal to himself.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) rose to ask two questions. The right hon. Gentleman desired the appeal to be presented to the Court of Session—a most convenient tribunal for the Department, because the Court held its sittings in Edinburgh, where the Department had its branch offices. At the same time the inconvenience to the school boards, he would imagine, would be great, and the expense of an appeal to the Court of Session would be far greater than an appeal to the Sheriff Court. Why should not the appeal be to the Sheriff Court? The next question he wished to ask was with regard to the payment of costs—

> "And the Court shall, before granting or refusing the prayer of such petition, consider any representations made in answer thereto by the members proposed to be surcharged, and the Court shall have power to find that the expenses of the said proceedings shall be payable by the said members personally or out of the school fund as may appear just.'"

What about the expenses incurred by the school board when the Department failed? Was the school board to pay in any event?

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said the right hon. Gentleman's proposal was acceptable as to all the larger boards, but as to the smaller ones, he thought that something was to be said for the modification which had been suggested, because the expense of going to the Court of Session would be considerable. It would be rather hard upon them to have the Court of Session flourished in their face by the Education Department who raised the question of surcharge. While he was quite ready to accept the Secretary for Scotland's proposal as regarded the larger boards he thought that there ought to be some modification in reference to the smaller boards.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (MR. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs) said the point raised was well worthy of consideration, as was that put by the hon. Member for Stirlingshire. The cases would not be many and would arise mostly where there had been some error in law. It was most desirable to have such cases dealt with by the highest judicial authority so that their decision would be applicable to every school board in Scotland. He would point out that they might get an excellent decision by the sheriff in one county while in another they might get a sheriff's judgment which would necessitate the whole case being tried over again.

MR. RAINY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said he had an Amendment on the Paper which he had put down because he had taken into consideration the question of expense, but after the explanation of the Lord-Advocate he did not propose to move it.

*MR. COCHRANE pointed out that it might be in the power of the Education Board to drag any one of the 972 school boards in Scotland before the Court of Session. If the school board happened to be right, who was to pay the board's expenses?

MR. THOMAS SHAW was understood to say that in the Scottish Department they were not troubled about the question of costs.

Amendment agreed to,

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) who had given notice of the following Amendment to Clause 21—"to leave out from 'Department,' to end of subsection, and insert 'and any sum not shown to the Department to have been properly expended in giving instruction required or permitted by minute of the Department in force for the time being shall be deducted from the next grant payable to the school'"—said it raised a drafting point. As he read the words of subsection (3), the result of them was that the unfortunate managers of these schools would not be able to get any money paid to them until it had been shown that it had been properly expended, and the consequence would be that they might have to go on without it for many months. That he submitted was the construction of the words. He thought that if there was any doubt about them at all they ought to be set right. When he raised the point in Committee the right hon. Gentleman promised to consider it, and he believed that the alternative words which he now suggested would perfectly carry out the intention which they had in view.

MR. SINCLAIR said the hon. Member's Amendment was not necessary. The words in the Bill would be better left as they were. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that no such ill consequences as he anticipated would follow. He had made inquiries on the point and could give him that assurance.

MR. JAMES HOPE: May I take it that the right hon. Gentleman is assured that there will be no such result as I have suggested?

MR. SINCLAIR: Yes.

MR. JAMES HOPE: In that case I do not move.

MR. COCHRANE, in moving an Amendment providing that school boards might apply to the Accountant of the Scottish Education Department for advice as to expenditure to be incurred, said the object which he had in view was that school boards should be entitled to ask the advice of the Accountant of the Department as to whether any item of expenditure which they proposed to incur was legal or illegal. He thought it desirable that a school board, if it was anxious to know whether it could incur any particular expenditure, such, for instance, as the feeding of school children, or any other point, should have the opportunity of applying to the Department for advice and assistance in the matter. Although the Department were undoubtedly very courteous, yet if any one approached them as to a point such as those to which he had referred, they invariably answered that it was a legal question and they were not qualified to give a reply. But the Accountant of the Department would surely have to decide whether an expenditure was legal or not, and if he were asked beforehand, he could give an opinion on the matter. His desire was that the Accountant's power to do so should be expressed in the Bill, thus giving the school boards the right to ask for an opinion before entering upon any expenditure which they had in contemplation, and about which they were in doubt.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 30, at end, to insert the words '(4) Any school board shall be entitled to make application to the Accountant of the Department respecting any expenditure which they may propose to incur. If such expenditure receives the sanction of the Accountant of the Department it shall not subsequently be regarded as an illegal payment liable to be disallowed or surcharged on the person or persons making such payment.' "—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said the hon. Gentleman was perfectly right. It was a common practice for school boards to write asking the Department their view on a particular expenditure about which they had doubt, and the Department gave such answer as was in their power. But the Department could not take the responsibility of interpreting the law in some particular respect. Of course the present practice would continue, for there was no desire on the part of the Department to discourage the applications of school boards for help and guidance such as the Department could give. This Amendment was part of the hon. Gentleman's own scheme, but there was difficulty in accepting it, because neither the Accountant nor the Department could give a decision as to the legality of a payment; that duty rested with the Court, and it would be very difficult for the Accountant or the Department to give advice, however willing they might be to do so, on some point of an intricate nature. Otherwise, they might express an opinion which afterwards proved to be contrary to the decision of the Court. He thought that on the whole the Bill would be better without the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON thought that the right hon. Gentleman might consider the proposal of his hon. friend in view of the fact that it was the Accountant who now set the machinery of surcharge in motion. If the right hon. Gentleman looked at the first words of the subsection he would see that they were—

"If it shall appear to the Accountant of the Department acting in pursuance of this section that any payment is, in his opinion, contrary to law, etc—"

He imagined that his hon. friend would really be satisfied if he could get that expression of opinion from the Accountant of the Department, not at the time when he was intervening and setting the machinery in motion for surcharge, but before the proposed expenditure was incurred.

MR. SINCLAIR: The hon. Gentleman attaches too much judicial weight to the Accountant's Department.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said he could not agree with his hon. friend who had moved this Amendment, to which the answer was perfectly simple. The Accountant was not really an accountant in the ordinary sense. By the Act of 1872 the word "accountant" was applied to a man who was an auditor. Was it possible for a man who was an auditor as well as accountant to give an opinion beforehand as regarded the accounts? He remembered on one occasion, in connection with a large school, he asked the opinion of the auditor as to certain expenditure, and he received the reply, politely conveyed, that he was to use his own judgment and that he would give his decision on that exercise of judgment afterwards.

MR. J. M. HENDERSON said that in all his experience he had never known of an Act of Parliament which provided that they should be told beforehand whether what they were doing was right or wrong. That was a thing which they must risk.

*MR. COCHRANE pointed out that local authorities constantly applied to the Local Government Board in Scotland for advice in similar circumstances to those he had in mind in connection with this proposal, and they always got a reply informing them whether a payment was legal or not. A great many of these 972 school boards were probably anxious to keep within the law, and if they could get advice by application to the Education Department it would make the matter easy for them. He, however, should not press his Amendment at that hour of the night, because there was a general understanding that they were to get the Bill through. He merely wanted the hon. Gentleman to understand that it was quite a sensible Amendment which might well have found a place in the Bill in order to keep small school boards in the right direction. He begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. JAMES HOPE, who had given notice of his intention to move the omission of subsection (1) of Clause 22, said his only object in putting down his Amendment was to call attention to the inconsistency between adopting the loan system for the school board and not adopting it for big national works like Rosyth. He would not press the matter.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 31, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'at each election after the election taking place in the year nineteen hundred and nine.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir Henry Craik.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Amendment of the hon. Member for Renfrew† is beyond the scope of the Bill. By a side wind it would alter the system of local franchise.

MR. WATT moved an Amendment which he said would have the effect of postponing the first election until 1911. At the last moment the Government had departed from their original position, and had gone back to the scheme of having the election in the spring of 1909. Preparations for such an election coming on so soon as April or May, 1909, would really be impossible. A roll had to be prepared, which took a very long time. November was the month usually allocated for the beginning of the making of the roll. That month was near its end already, and the Bill was not yet on the Statute-book. The preparation of the roll would be made more elaborate by the fact that under the Bill new electoral districts would be instituted by the Secretary for Scotland. In subsection (4) it was indicated that on the application of a school board the Department might divide a school board district into two or more electoral divisions, define the boundaries of such divisions, and fix the number of members. All these preparations had to be gone into before the rolls were elaborated and the election took place. On that account, if on no other, it would be much wiser to permit the present school boards to continue their existence until 1911, and thus bridge over the time. Under the Government scheme the school boards throughout Scotland would be elected in 1909, and would sit for two years. It was a well-known fact that even under the present law a new school board took at least a year to get into harness, and that with the changes brought about by this Bill the school boards would have much greater difficulty in getting to understand their work. The first year of these new boards would be spent in getting to know what they were to do. It was a notorious fact that during the last year of the lives of school boards they were in a condition of terror of the electorate whom they would have to meet, and they initiated very few new schemes. So that they would be deprived of the middle year of their lives when they really did some good for the country.

---

† The following is the Amendment referred to:—"In Clause 25, after the word 'district,' to insert the words 'Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, a married woman, otherwise possessing the qualification for being registered as an elector may be registered in respect of the same property as her husband; and.'"—(*Mr. Laidlaw.*)

MR. PIRIE, in seconding, thought the House must be impressed by the reasonableness of the Amendment. Up to that morning it was the scheme in contemplation by the Government, so that there must be a great deal to be said for it. It was most dangerous in view of the new duties which would fall upon school boards that possibly a great number of men new to educational work might be elected to carry out these new regulations. It would be infinitely more judicious, and in the interests of educational efficiency, if the old members of the school boards had been allowed for the first two years to carry out the absolutely new methods which the Bill would bring into effect. He hoped, if the Government persisted in their attitude ——

MR. YOUNGER: On a point of order, might I ask whether these words, having been inserted in the Bill on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman, do not involve the necessity for an election in 1909?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think so. Of course, it is a little involved, but the way I read it would be: "The electors in any election after the election taking place if there is one."

MR. YOUNGER: There is one by law now, and it must take place in 1909.

MR. PIRIE hoped, if the Government persisted in their attitude, the ratepayers would weigh the desirability of returning old members of the school boards to carry out entirely new duties. In any case it was desirable that the Amendment should be moved in order to get a full explanation of the extraordinary change of attitude of the Government at the last moment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 33, to leave out from the word 'district,' to end of subsection, and to insert the words 'Provided that an existing school board holding office at the passing of this Act shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, retain office until the first election of school boards under this Act, which election shall take place in the year nineteen hundred and eleven, being the year following the year of a parish council election.'"—(*Mr. Watt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the second word 'the' in page 22, line 34, stand part of the Bill."

MR. SINCLAIR hoped he should not offend his hon. friends if he asked them to be good enough not to press the Amendment. It was a point of some importance, but not of cardinal importance. It was quite true what they said, and there was a good deal to be said on both sides. It had been his duty to endeavour to arrive at a reasonable compromise on points which were not very vital or of essential importance in the interests of the measure as a whole. This measure had to be worked by people in Scotland. It imposed certain conditions and obligations on a large number of people in Scotland. In the ordinary course the present school boards would have exhausted their mandate by next spring. That was an argument of some strength, and it went rather against the arguments of the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment. After making very careful inquiry, he had found himself in a minority, and he thought it his duty to withdraw from the position which the Government took up in Committee, and to leave the election to take place in its normal way in the spring.

MR. WATT: On that statement I ask leave to withdraw.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 22, line 34, to leave out from the word '1872' to end of line 38."

"In page 22, line 39, after the word 'election,' to insert the words 'after the election in the year nineteen hundred and nine.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. JAMES HOPE, in moving to leave out subsection (3), said the object of his Amendment was to preserve the cumulative vote which was necessary for the protection of minorities. He had no fear that any conscious or deliberate injustice would be perpetrated by school boards upon any minority, but they would feel it a loss and a deprivation, and indirectly they would be left out of the power of controlling matters which were of great interest and importance to them. Under earlier clauses of the Bill certain powers were given to school boards with regard to schools in their area but not under their control. He did not profess that the cumulative vote was an ideal system and he did not doubt that the system of the hon. Member for Ayr might be better had they time to discuss it. Under the English Education Act there was special provision for minorities in the constitution of the education committees. If the franchise was changed to the ordinary political franchise in Scotland there would be no room for these minorities. Speaking specially for his own co-religionists who did not like the other provisions of this Bill with regard to finance, if this cumulative vote was taken away from them they would feel that they were hardly and harshly treated. He did not believe that was the intention of the right hon. Gentleman and he would lose nothing by keeping the cumulative vote in.

Mr. WATT seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 23, line 5, to leave out subsection (3)."—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the subsection down to the word 'give,' in line 6, stand part of the clause."

Mr. SINCLAIR said they approached this clause with two Amendments on the Paper, one to reinstate the cumulative vote and the other introducing the system of proportional representation. For his own part he regretted extremely that it was not possible to abolish the cumulative vote in Scotland. Very strong representations had reached him as to the inconveniences which would arise if the cumulative vote was not passed into law. That being so, and holding the view that, after all, the education system, if it was to be worked for the benefit of the people of Scotland, must work without friction, the Government had been obliged, and thought it well, to re-consider their position in the matter. One alternative held out was contained in the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Ayrshire dealing with the system of proportional representation, and he thought that Amendment might have gone some way in the direction of satisfying the views of some of those who supported the cumulative vote. On the other hand, it could not be denied that it was a somewhat serious thing to adopt in an Act of Parliament by a side wind the principle of proportional representation, even though its application was confined to local elections. That was a new principle which he did not know that the House of Commons as at present constituted had ever had an opportunity of really discussing. On the whole he thought it was better to take the simpler plan, and as they could not secure unanimity as to the abolition of the cumulative vote the Government had decided to leave it in existence where it was. He was sorry for it, but he thought it was a necessity of the situation, and he advised his hon. friend on the Ministerial side of the House to take that view of the matter. There was other business to come on, and he suggested to the hon. Member for Sheffield who had moved the omission of this subsection—which course the Government agreed to—not to press his Amendment to omit the next subsection which the Government preferred should remain in the Bill. He assented to the Motion to omit subsection 3.

Mr. JAMES HOPE thanked the Secretary for Scotland for meeting him so far, and he did not think it would be necessary under the circumstances to move his other Amendment.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON greatly deplored the decision of the Government on this point. He said that certainly not from any want of consideration for hon. Gentlemen opposite who wished to retain the cumulative vote, but because he thought their object could have been better attained by the proposal of the hon. Member for South Ayrshire in favour of proportional representation. The proportional system of representation would have provided them with a good voting system, whereas cumulative voting was a thoroughly bad one. The only really progressive section left in the Bill now was that relating to continuation classes. With that exception this was a reactionary Bill, and to go back on the cumulative vote was the most unfortunate step the Government had taken.

MR. BOLAND congratulated the Secretary for Scotland on the line he had taken up, because he had tried to meet the views of those who had been contending for the rights of minorities. Subsection (6) of Clause 3 gave power to provide free stationery not only to board schools, but to voluntary schools, and if the cumulative vote had been abolished, it was quite possible in some districts where voluntary schools were not looked upon with favour that the school board might have withdrawn from voluntary schools the right to have free books and stationery, which the supporters of the Bill claimed was one of the great advantages given to voluntary schools by this measure. He thought it was absolutely necessary that the cumulative vote should be retained. The right hon. Gentleman had done the right thing by preserving for minorities the cumulative vote.

MR. BEALE (Ayrshire, S.) assumed that the course taken by the Government rendered his Amendment in favour of proportional representation impossible because it took out the subsection to which that Amendment related. He might say that so far as the representation of minorities went he was delighted, although he was not satisfied that the course the Government had taken was the right one. After the speech of the hon. Member for Leith Burghs he had some hope that they would get before long a better system than the cumulative vote for attaining the same very desirable object.

*MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs) said he was very much surprised at the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, because he had hoped that the clumsy, antiquated, cumbrous and unsatisfactory methods provided by the cumulative vote would have been abolished. He thought the plan adopted in the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Ayrshire provided a real solution of the difficulty of the representation of minorities in a scientific form. The cumulative vote was a most unscientific way of attaining that object.

*MR. MORTON expressed his regret that the Secretary for Scotland had given way on this point. He did not know whom the right hon. Gentleman had taken his orders from, but he had certainly not consulted the Scottish Members. He understood a few days ago that the right hon. Gentleman was going to stick to his Bill, and he regretted that he had not had the courage to do so.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) expressed his gratification at the decision of the Government on this point. His hon. friend opposite said he did not know where the Secretary for Scotland got his authority from. He would remind him that the Scottish Members upstairs were consulted and the Government very narrowly escaped defeat on this very subject. [Cries of "No."] The hon. Member who interrupted him evidently was not present when this subject was debated upstairs. Those who were present, however, were genuine Scotsmen and not Englishmen sitting for Scottish constituencies. He had listened with interest to the remarks made by the hon. Member for Dumfries who had described the cumulative voting system as clumsy and antiquated. That was not the first time that those words had been used, because the Opposition had frequently used the same words as applied to free trade. That, however, did not settle the question. The cumulative vote was the only system which could give fair representation to minorities, and the scheme with which the hon. Member opposite had fallen in love, namely, proportional representation, would not give fair representation to minorities. They were contending for a fair representation for minorities, and having regard to the fact that they had at the present moment educational peace in Scotland he claimed that it was largely owing to the cumulative voting system under which representatives of all denominations could obtain seats on the Education Board. That system allowed the representatives of all denominations to sit around a common board, and in that way they learned to know and respect one another. It was largely on account of that system that they had no religious differences in Scotland, and it would have been absolutely deplorable if the Government, finding that there was no religious controversy in Scotland, had proceeded by this Bill to create an educational difficulty and bitterness where none had existed previously. For those reasons he rejoiced at the decision of the Government, and if hon. Members opposite were only allowed to speak their opinions to-night he felt sure an overwhelming majority of them would declare themselves in favour of the decision at which the Government had arrived. [Cries of "No."] The Scottish Members to-night were not allowed to speak, because they had all been muzzled at the peril of their political existence. He felt sure if they were free and the Government Whips were not put on an overwhelming majority of Scottish Members would declare in favour of this fair representation of minorities in Scotland.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said they had now reached a very important stage of this Bill, because they were called upon to settle the principle upon which the representation of school boards should be based. The present system offered some advantages for the representation of minorities, but they were now considering the whole system *de novo*. They were putting new provisions on the Statute-book, and surely that was an occasion when they might consider whether cumulative voting was the best means of obtaining results which they all desired. He regretted to find that upon an occasion of this sort, for reasons which he could not understand, the proper discussion of the question at issue was being burked. He was extremely anxious to hear the views of the hon. Member for South Ayrshire upon proportional representation. He was anxious to hear what were the objections to which the cumulative vote was open. [Cries of "Agreed."] If muzzled Members of the Liberal Party below the gangway were agreed, he wished it to be understood that there was no such muzzling on his side of the House. Regret would be largely felt in Scotland that this occasion had been allowed to pass without a discussion of the principle embodied in the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Ayrshire.

*Mr. McCALLUM (Paisley) said he desired to join those who had thanked the Government for the course they had taken in this matter. As one who had often taken advantage of the cumulative vote, he thought it was only fair that the minority should be considered. Catholics and Nonconformists had surely some rights as ratepayers, and under the system provided by the cumulative vote they were able to obtain representation which under other methods they would not be able to secure. The Government had acted wisely and with great advantage to the cause of education in making a graceful surrender.

Mr. R. DUNCAN said it had been constantly reiterated that there was very great harmony between Catholics and Protestants in Scotland. The reason for that harmony was that there had been a desire on the part of the people to remember the fundamentals on which they were agreed, and to try to forget those matters on which they were not yet agreed. They would be taking a backward step if by abolishing the cumulative vote they were practically to disfranchise the Catholics in Scotland. Ninety per cent. of the people of Scotland were Protestants and Presbyterians, and he thought nothing need be done to render Catholics less powerful than they were now. He was glad the Government had come to the decision to retain the cumulative vote, which, although in some respects a clumsy method, was a means by which minorities of the ratepayers could obtain representation.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON moved to insert the words "before granting or refusing the prayer of the petition and complaint" after the word "shall" in line 30. He said this was merely a drafting Amendment designed to clear up the question whether the function of the Court in dealing with defaulting governing bodies was purely ministerial or to a certain extent judicial. The Secretary for Scotland would as a matter of law state whether the words were unnecessary. He wished to get a public assurance on the point from the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 23, line 30, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'before granting or refusing the prayer of the petition and complaint.'"—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR assured the hon. Gentleman that the words were not necessary to obtain the purpose he had in view.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 3, after the second word 'exceeding,' to insert the words 'seven hundred pounds per annum in the case of endowments the revenues of which before the passing of this Act might be applied to purposes in two or more counties, or in any other case not exceeding.'"—(*Mr. Watt.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said the hon. Member for the Elgin Burghs communicated with him on the subject of this Amendment. He was sorry that he was not able to accept the Amendment. The clause was very carefully considered and the protection of endowment authorities was sufficiently provided for. He hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 12, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that the governing body of any intermediate or secondary school administered under a scheme approved in terms of the Educational Endowments (Scotland) Act, 1882, or under any Act or any Provisional Order confirmed by Act of Parliament, shall, notwithstanding anything contained in any scheme, Act, or Order, have power, with the sanction of the Department, to administer that part of their annual revenue, presently applicable to the granting of bursaries, in conformity with the requirements of Section twenty-eight thereof without the necessity of applying to the Court of Session or to Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR referred the hon. Member to page 25, lines 5 to 8, where there were the words—

"Notwithstanding any provision of the scheme hitherto regulating the number, amount, conditions of tenure, or method of award of the bursaries, be applied by the governing body to the granting of bursaries in conformity with the general scheme for the district as aforesaid."

He was advised that these words fully met the point of the hon. Member's Amendment. He would give the hon. Member the undertaking that if they did not fully cover it the words would be accepted.

MR. COCHRANE asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 40, after the word 'council,' to insert the words 'or county education committee.'"—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said the Amendment had been moved no doubt because of an apprehension that the interests of servants were in danger under the Bill. That was not so. They would be in the same position under the secondary education committee as under a county council. The same protection would be extended to them, and there was no need for the Amendment.

MR. COCHRANE asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. GULLAND moved to insert in Clause 32—the interpretation clause—after the word "Department," the words "which in future shall be called the Scottish Education Department." As between the words "Scotch" and "Scottish," one word was wrong and the other right both officially and unofficially. He would call the attention of the Secretary for Scotland to the fact that the Scotch Education Department was housed in the Scottish office, that it had charge of the Royal Scottish Museum, and that this Bill was considered and amended by the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills. That was a sufficient reason for his Amendment. He had consulted the Edinburgh Directory and found that there were in that city 123 Scottish societies and three Scotch; while in the Glasgow Directory there were 122 Scottish Societies and three Scotch. They ought to use the word "Scottish" where it ought to be used. He begged to move.

AN HON. MEMBER seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 26, line 10, after the word 'Department, to insert the words 'which in future shall be called the Scottish Education Department.'"—(*Mr. Gulland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. THOMAS SHAW said he wished that they had a little time to discuss this Amendment. As a temperance reformer, the mover of the Amendment had an objection to the word "Scotch." He did not agree with those people who wanted to call themselves Scottish. The real authority on all things Scotch was Robert Burns, and one of his best poems was about an "Auld Scotch drink." Then there was Byron's poem about "English bards, and Scotch reviewers." Every author of eminence—Burns, Byron, Scott—would have been affronted at the idea of their attempting to get the word "Scottish" in two syllables when they had the strong, sensible, and suggestive word "Scotch" in one syllable.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 26, line 25, to leave out the word 'Third,' and to insert the word 'Second.'"

"In page 27, line 17, to leave out the word 'Fourth,' and to insert the word 'Third.'"

"In page 29, to leave out Schedule 2.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. PIRIE said that some of the features in connection with this Bill were unparalleled in the annals of Scottish legislation. It might be said that he was exceeding his rights in saying a word on the Third Reading, but he did not think so. He asked the House to consider the time given to this Scottish Education Bill as compared with the time given to the English education measure. When the Scottish Members asked for time to discuss the Bill on Report and on the Third Reading stage, they were told a fortnight ago that it was a non-contentious Bill, and that it should go through the House in the course of one sitting including the Third Reading. On the first day of the Report stage it was discussed from four o'clock in the afternoon to two o'clock in the morning. Since that time a great number of new Amendments had been placed upon the notice paper by the Government, making changes in the Bill, and most of them were good. What would have happened to the new Amendments had the original idea been carried out? Those Scottish Members who had revolted against the treatment meted out to Scotland had surely been justified in their attitude from the fact that many of the Amendments which had been put down had been accepted. He had had twelve years' service in the House, and in all that long experience he did not think he had ever known Scottish business to be so treated as it had been during this session and the last. It was becoming more and more apparent as time went on that this House was not the proper place to manage Scottish business. [Cries of "Home Rule."] In another statement the Prime Minister said that the Bill was non-contentious. Were the Scottish Members under the Party system not like a poor starving dog which must take what was thrown to it without complaint? That was why Scotland was anxious to get this Bill. It had been said that the Bill was closely connected with the old-age pension scheme for teachers, and that it was important from a Treasury point of view that the Bill should pass that day. That brought him to a matter the like of which he trusted would never happen again. The rumour had been sedulously circulated in the Lobby yesterday that unless the Bill was passed by 8.15 that night, it would be dropped, and he had had a letter written to him saying that it was necessary that the Bill should be passed by a certain time. That was holding a pistol at the head of the Scottish Members telling them to pass the Bill, or else they were not doing their duty. He hoped such a thing would never be repeated. He did not know who was to blame, but it was clear that the party whips had regarded party alone; and not the interests of Scottish legislation. The Scottish Members had every right in doing their duty, indignantly to repudiate such treatment, and to declare that they would have none of it. There was one other feature to which he would like to call the attention of the House. The Bill had been before the Standing Committee for fourteen or fifteen sittings. Scotland, at the present moment, had the advantage of possessing ten or twelve Members who sat on the Treasury Bench. Those Members were naturally among the ablest of the Scottish representatives. They were men whose opinion would be of some value in shaping Scottish legislation, but by the system of Scottish Grand Committees they were debarred from and had not actually taken any part at all in the discussions of this measure in Committee. That meant to say that ten or twelve Scottish constituencies were practically disfranchised. [AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.] Some of those hon. Members were eminent authorities on Scottish education, including the Secretary for War who, when this Bill was before the last Parliament had taken a prominent part in the discussions in Committee. There was one great blot on the measure—it was a matter which he had brought up on the Second Reading stage—and that was, that the opportunity had been lost of transferring the Scottish Education Department from London to Edinburgh. He had always thought that was a most vital point, and that the people of Scotland had a right to manage their own educational affairs in their own country. In his preface to a valuable work on Scottish educational reform, the Secretary of State, who had been a Scottish Member for upwards of twenty-two years and who was a member of the Education Committee of Scotland, expressed the view that the administration ought to be centred in Scotland and not at Dover House, many hundreds of miles away. Having written that, it was the bounden duty of the right hon. Gentleman to support in Committee an Amendment to that effect, and to forward his views in the House of Commons. Until this change was effected the administration could not be effectively carried on. There were fifty Scottish officials of the Scottish Education Department in London and 118 in Scotland, and it stood to reason that where the latter number was the headquarters of the Department ought to be. The amount of the salaries of the Scottish officials in London was £13,000, and in Scotland £40,000, and it stood to reason that where the salaries of the officials were the most numerous. the head of the Department ought to be. All the other Scottish boards, eight in number, were practically centred in Scotland. Surely it was a strong argument that the Education Department should be in Scotland that the Local Government Board was carried on there, because the latter had more administrative work to do than the Education Department, and that Board was both legislative and administrative. What would his hon. friends from Ireland say if the Irish Education Department were to be situated in London, and surely Scotland had a right to ask that she should have the same advantages as Ireland. Take the question of the legal officers. Parliament did not sit during a great part of the year, and during that period at least they ought to be in Edinburgh to control the legal work. It was not treating the Scottish school boards fairly in the management of their business, unless they were given a close personal association with the Department, and if the office was in Edinburgh it would lessen the number of deputations from Scotland to England, and also reduce the correspondence. As to the ostensible reasons given against the change by those who professed to wish for it, it was a case of "save me from my friends." They said they were in favour of it, if they were given a Parliament in Scotland, and had Home Rule first. He said that if they transferred the Education Board to Scotland, Home Rule would necessarily follow. The Secretary for Scotland said they would transfer the Department to-morrow if they could also transfer the power of Parliament to control it, but Parliament did not do so. It had been the curse of Scotland—this alleged control of the Education Department by Scottish Members, and the influence of Scottish Members in the House was a myth and an illusion. The control of Parliament was wholly illusory, and the Department was dominated by the officials. It was said by the Secretary for Scotland that the Scottish Education Department being one of the largest spending Departments should be located close to the Treasury in order that negotiations to get more money might proceed. He never heard of such an argument being put forward by a Minister. They did not want to get any money by back door influences, but they wanted what they were entitled to, and no more. Then they were told that the officials of the Department had established themselves in London, and had long leases of their houses, and it would be rather unfair to disturb them. He was perfectly ready that the change should only take place in five years time. There was one thing they had gained by discussion, however, because they now knew that this change could be brought about by administrative action. He could assure the Secretary for Scotland that they would leave no stone unturned until the Scottish people realised the importance of this matter. He asked hon. Members to put the question firmly and straightforwardly before the democracy, and it would not be long before the change was brought about. They had had thirty-six years of this Department; for that period no great educational reform had been carried out in Scotland, and he thought that such a state of things was lamentable. He was pleading not only with the members of the House, but with the Scottish people to say that as it was the inviolable right of a private individual that he should be able to take an active interest in the education of his own off-spring, so it was the great duty of a nation to take an active interest in the education of its own children. In insisting upon that they were fulfilling one of the most sacred duties that could fall upon any nation. He pleaded for this change as he had never pleaded for anything in the House before, and he held that it was in the highest interests of Scotland and its education that she should have the right which he advocated. The result of this Bill, he was sorry to say, had not been to free Scotland from the Education Department, but to rivet the fetters upon her, but he looked forward to the time when the many obstacles which prevented Scotland from controlling her own education and her own affairs would be removed.

Mr. BOLAND said the members of the Irish Party for whom he and the hon. Member for South Down had been acting had hoped that before the Bill emerged from the Report stage the financial arrangements would have been settled satisfactorily, and it was with great regret that they came to the Third Reading, and found that they were practically in the same position as they were when they started. The House would remember how, when the Report stage was under discussion, they moved that the Bill should be re-committed so that Clause 15 might be discussed again, and that the Catholic, and in fact, all the voluntary schools in Scotland should have some opportunity of competing, not on level terms, but on fair terms with the school boards in Scotland, and the House would remember how after three hours discussion it was disclosed to them that there would be a residue of 2s. per child for voluntary schools in Scotland. He willingly conceded that the Secretary for Scotland had met their claim about the cumulative vote in a generous manner, but he did not consider that the financial arrangements of the Bill were satisfactory, and consequently they must take a division against the Bill. Under the English education scheme which was now before the country the Catholic schools would get a minimum of 46s., rising to a maximum of 55s. per head. The utmost the Catholic schools in Scotland received was 40s. 5¾d. per head, and even though they got the additional 2s. which was promised them recently, the grant would not reach even the minimum proposed in England. The grant of free books might mean another small amount, but it did not give the minimum grant which was given in England to contracting-out schools. He mentioned this to show that the Roman Catholics of Scotland for whom he had the honour of speaking did not think they had been fairly treated, and he would only say in conclusion that as the financial clauses of the Bill were unsatisfactory, for that and for no other reason it was necessary to divide on the Third Reading.

*MR. MORTON agreed with his hon. friend the Member for the Northern Division of the City of Aberdeen that Scotland had not had fair play, so far as legislation in this House was concerned. It was useless to complain, however, because a Liberal Government, largely composed of Scottish Members, was against them and utterly neglected Scotland. This was the only Bill which they had got through or nearly through, except the Tobacco Act, which the Government had opposed. He regretted that the religious question had been raised by the hon. Member who had just sat down. He thought that in Scotland they had got beyond that, yet Irish Members unfortunately, notwithstanding the support Scottish Members had given them on Irish affairs, interfered in the purely local affairs of Scotland. Ireland perhaps was not in as good a position as Scotland, and not so well-governed; but that was their own fault. If they had given England a Bannockburn 100 or 200 years ago they would not now be in the position of a conquered country—which Scotland never was—and be governed as such. He hoped that the Bill would be passed, and that Scotland would get something, if not all that she ought to have. In this matter he noticed that the Members of the Treasury Bench—with one exception—had got for their constituencies the larger share of the money, but that as usual they had neglected the poorer constituencies. However, he was thankful that the people of Scotland were to get something, as much as the front bench would allow; and he had no doubt without the help of the Irish Members they would be able to show the people of the United Kindom how to carry on the education of the Scottish people, and he hoped that the Irish Members would profit by it. Surely Scottish affairs should be managed by and in the interest of the Scottish people.

*MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.) said that if the hon. Member opposite would put himself in the position of a Protestant minority in a practically self-governed Ireland, and assume that the Protestant children there were compelled either to go to a Catholic school or contract out, and that if they contracted-out they had to find something like 25s. a head, he would see that the humanitarian point of view was rather at fault.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 195; Noes, 48. (Division List No. 415.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork. S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn, W(T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S
Clark, George Smith
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E

Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,WH.(St.Pancras,N.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.HnSirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,RobertV.(Montrose)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithness-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,WE.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hills, J. W.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Houston, Robert Paterson
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C.(Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir RobertJ.(Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Renton, Leslie
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Samuel,Rt.HnH.L.(Cleveland)
Scott,AH.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw,SirCharlesEdw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thompson,J.WH.(Somerset,E)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Wardle, George J.
Wason,RtHn.E.(Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh)
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Younger, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Boland, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cross, Alexander
Cullinan, J.
Dillon, John
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gretton, John
Halpin, J.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hogan, Michael
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Patrick A.(Queen'sCo.)
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Noes — Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF CRIME BILL.

As amended by the Standing Committee, considered.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The proposed new clause† in the name of the hon. Member for Bethnal Green is beyond the scope of the Bill.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said he would like to draw attention to the title of the Bill. It was "to make better provision for the prevention of crime and for that purpose to provide for the reformation of young offenders and the prolonged detention of habitual criminals and for other purposes incidental thereto."

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said that the words "other purposes incidental thereto" did not mean any Amendment of the Prisons Acts the hon. Member might desire to move. The proposed new clause was an Amendment of the Prisons Acts, not of this Bill.

*Mr. RENTON (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough) said the Amendment he rose to move referred to the treatment of persons under the Borstal system. It would be a great pity to lay down any hard and fast rule such as was laid down in the Bill as to the discretion of the Judges, and he wanted to urge that the Court should be given unlimited discretion as to those whom they might sentence to undergo imprisonment under the Borstal system. Such discretion was already given under Clause 3 to the Home Secretary. Surely the Judge who tried the case, saw the prisoner and heard what he had to say, and who had all the facts before him and could ascertain the antecedents of the prisoner, was as good a judge as to who should or should not be sent to a Borstal institution as any official could be. Under the Bill, no person over twenty-one years of age could be sentenced for detention under the Borstal system, but he thought it would be recognised that in some cases a lad of eighteen might be a more hardened criminal than some lad of maturer age fresh from the country. It might be said that unless they had a hard and fast rule as to age of Borstal prisoners, administrative difficulties would ensue, but it would not be difficult to send elder prisoners to one institution, others to a second, and the younger prisoners to a third institution. The Home Secretary had power to create more Borstal institutions if they were needed. He failed, therefore, to see that any administrative difficulties would ensue. If the system was good for boys, surely it was good for young men. He thought it would be a disaster if they laid down a hard and fast rule that no young criminal over the age of twenty-one should be sent to a Borstal institution and they should not leave it to the discretion of the Judge as to who should or who should not go to a Borstal institution. The system had been more or less of a success and he anticipated that in future years it would have far greater success. A good many people said it was a failure, that it was only urged by sentimentalists, and that it would not have had even its present success had it not been for the splendid committee who administer it. 189 prisoners were discharged from Borstal institutions in the last year for which they had figures, twenty-three of them were recommitted, and twenty-seven were reported as not doing well. He would venture, however, to point out that out of the 189 dealt with, no less than 151 had an average of four previous convictions. The system should be given a good chance. If it were, he was convinced they would have no need whatsoever for Part II. of the Bill. Supposing Judges found that it was a failure, they need not sentence any more to detention under the Borstal system. They could revert to the old system and sentence prisoners to hard labour or penal servitude. If the system, however, was good, as they had every reason to believe it was, it should be extended. The penal system in this country was, he believed, the most rigorous of any civilised nation, and by the second part of this Bill it was admitted to be a failure. It neither reformed nor did it deter. He begged the House, therefore, to give the Court every discretion in the trial of prisoners so that, if a Judge thought any man would be reformed by being sent to a Borstal institution, he might so order. He firmly believed, from his own knowledge, that the Borstal system would be far cheaper in the end, and at all events it would be far more humane than the system of punishments which obtained in the country at the present moment.

---

† The following is the clause referred to:—"On the occurrence of the next vacancy in the office of Prison Commissioner and Director of Convict Prisons a woman shall be appointed to the office, and thenceforward one Prison Commissioner and Director of Convict Prisons at least shall always be a woman."

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) seconded, not for the reasons given by his hon. friend, but rather for the peculiarity of the regulation drawn up in the section. The Judge who tried the case had the simple power to send a person between sixteen and twenty-one to a Borstal institution, but by the latter part of the section the most extravagant power was given to the Home Secretary to extend the age if he thought fit to twenty-three. He rather objected to that system of legislation. If they wanted to make the limit twenty-one, let them say so, and if they wanted to make the limit twenty-three let them make that limit. Again, the Home Secretary was to have power to deal with anybody up to any age. Though a Judge had not power to send a man to a Borstal institution, and, therefore, sentenced him to a year's imprisonment, the Home Secretary, in exercise of his extraordinary power under Clause 3, might come in and, if satisfied that the person sentenced might with advantage be detained in a Borstal institution, authorise the Prison Commissioners to transfer him from prison to a Borstal institution. It was perfectly clear the Home Secretary was to have unlimited discretion to send anybody of any age to a Borstal institution. That was, on the whole, right, but surely the Judge who tried the case ought to have the same discretion. It was a monstrous thing to give absolute power to the Secretary of State to send any person of any age to a Borstal institution whilst tying the discretion of a Judge to the cases of persons between sixteen and twenty-one years of age. He, therefore, seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) of Clause 1."—(*Major Renton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

***The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.) said the hon. and learned Member objected to the discretion which was left to the Home Secretary.

Mr. RAWLINSON said he distinctly stated that on the whole he thought it was a good thing that the Secretary of State should have discretion, but the Judge who tried the case certainly ought to have an equal discretion.

***Mr. GLADSTONE** said he did not quite understand the hon. and learned Member. He had great sympathy with both the mover and the seconder of the Amendment, but he must point out what the effect of it would be. They had found in the working of the present informal Borstal system a great difficulty in inducing the Courts to send to the Borstal institutions in all cases the right kind of persons. Many Courts were cognisant of the working of that system, but for one reason or another mistakes were being constantly made and the wrong kind of persons were being sent to the institutions. He would read from the Home Office Circular the description of the kind of person they thought might go to a Borstal institution. It was as follows—

"The class of persons for whom the Borstal system is devised is not first offenders or novices in crime, but young recidivists guilty for the most part of acts of larceny, and rough, undisciplined lads, of the lounging and hooligan types, who are apparently drifting towards a career of crime."

Those were the persons they wished to get hold of. He would point out that the first part of the Bill related to young offenders, so that in a sense the Amendment was out of order having regard to the title of the Bill. He understood the hon. Member wished to remove the restrictions.

*MR. RENTON: No; surely youth is not limited to twenty-one years. Many people are youthful after twenty-one.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he understood the hon. Member wanted to remove the restriction on the age of sixteen as well as twenty-one.

*MR. RENTON said he imagined a Judge would not sentence anybody under sixteen to three years in a Borstal institution. He would send him to a reformatory or somewhere else.

*MR. GLADSTONE said his point was that it was not desirable in any case to send to the Borstal institution lads under sixteen. They ought to be dealt with either under the Children Act or the Reformatory Act. It was desirable to give reasonable directions to the Courts as to the kind of person who ought to be sent to Borstal. They said sixteen was the lowest age at which he ought to go. Then why not insert the limit of sixteen? Then they came to the limit of twenty-one. All he could say was that this matter was very carefully discussed. They considered whether they ought to give the Court free discretion to send to a Borstal institution persons above the age of twenty-one, and had come to the conclusion that on the whole it was not desirable, because if they mixed up different classes of men and juvenile adults the result must necessarily be harmful to their training and the general discipline of the institutions. Therefore, they thought there ought to be a definite limit imposed upon magistrates who perhaps did not quite know the working of the system, to keep them from the error of committing to Borstal institutions persons so far above the age of twenty-one that they were totally unsuitable for the institution. On the whole twenty-one was a reasonable age to fix. Then why, he might be asked, did they take power to raise it to twenty-three? For one reason they did not with to plunge too far into this matter at first. This was a new system. They did not know to what extent the Courts would avail themselves of it, and if they were to make it higher than twenty-one they might have too many cases to deal with before they were ready to receive them. As it was they would have largely to extend the Borstal prison.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) said his reason for supporting the Amendment was that he thought discretionary power should be done away with. At any rate, if any discretionary power were given at all the same power should be given to the Judge or person who tried the prisoner as was given to the Home Secretary, for this very obvious reason—that if there was anyone who was capable of exercising a discretion it was the Judge who saw the prisoner, tried him, and knew all the facts of the case. The Home Secretary had said that under this Borstal system the wrong prisoners were sent, or that he never got the right prisoners.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I never said that. I never said that we never got the right prisoners. I said sometimes the Court sent the wrong prisoners.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL said it amounted very much to the same thing. But that was not the point. Apparently, the difficulty was to get the right prisoners. It was far more likely that the right persons would be sent to the institutions if the age were fixed at twenty-three or twenty-five. It often happened that when the Judges were trying prisoners who were suitable in every way for the Borstal system the age-limit crept in and the Judges said that their discretionary power had ceased. Often between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-three these young men were suited to that particular treatment, and he suggested that the Home Secretary should make one age of twenty-three and give no discretionary power to the Secretary of State. That would meet the objection of his hon. friend and make the system much better and more workable than it was.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) thought the right hon. Gentleman did not quite understand the motive which had induced his hon. friend to move the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman said it was almost out of order, because it would deal with any age, whereas this section was only for the reformation of the young offender. Under Clause 3 the Secretary of State might send a man of eighty to a Borstal institution, so that if the Amendment was out of order this clause was out of order. There might be an explanation, but he could not see it. The right hon. Gentleman said under subsection (2) of Clause 1 the age could not be increased to twenty-three unless the Home Secretary laid an Order upon the Table for thirty days, and the House could move an Address to His Majesty objecting to the Order. But why was it limited to twenty-three? The two things were absolutely incompatible. Under this clause, unless the Amendment was carried and subsection (2) left out, the result would be that the Judge could only send a person to a Borstal institution provided he was between sixteen and twenty-one, but the Home Secretary could send him there if under twenty-three, provided he got an Order not objected to by the House of Commons. The difference, he supposed, was that this particular person must have been sentenced to penal servitude or imprisonment. He could see no other difference. In the first case, he might not have been sentenced. In the second, he must. The object of the Amendment was to give the Judge the same power that the Home Secretary possessed. He understood the right hon. Gentleman thought the Home Secretary's power should not be greater than the Judges'.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The object of Clause 3 is to give the Home Secretary power to correct a possible mistake by a Judge or magistrate from want of full knowledge of the particular man with whom he is dealing, and to transfer him from prison to a Borstal institution. The object obviously is that only persons of the same classes and ages who are admitted to Borstal institutions shall be so transferred from prison. We are perfectly ready to put in an Amendment in another place to meet that point.

Sir F. BANBURY: Then I will not press the point, beyond saying I think the Amendment should be put in in this place.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare N.) said the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge had advanced the very best reasons why the Amendment should not be accepted, because he had pointed to those sections in the Bill which provided the elasticity that was desired by the mover of the Amendment. When the matter was being considered upstairs they had all these suggestions and arguments put before them and they adhered to the clause because they knew they were at the same time going to preserve that elasticity which would be placed in the hands of the Home Secretary. They had considered very closely whether it would be desirable that men over twenty-one indiscriminately chosen by Judges who had not the proper opportunities of considering the characters of these men should be thrown in under the Borstal system amongst a lot of young persons of immature age and upon whose minds there might be a very bad impression made. They decided, therefore, that it was better to have some limit but at the same time that there should be placed in the hands of the Home Secretary a discretion to be exercised according to his judgment upon full consideration. Therefore the subsection was introduced raising the age of twenty-three. But that was not all. Clause 3 said the Secretary of State might, if satisfied that the person sentenced either before or after the passing of the Act to penal servitude or imprisonment might with advantage be detained in a Borstal institution, authorise the Prison Commissioners to transfer him from prison to a Borstal institution. Here were two methods of exercising judgment on the part of the Minister, who would have ample time and opportunity under circumstances not open to the Judge, of seeing whether the man could be with advantage transferred. The Amendment would unquestionably have his support if this elasticity were not contained in the Bill, because from his own experience he was in favour of anything which would extend the discretion, either on the part of the Judge or of the Minister, in favour of the prisoner. At the same time, he was restrained from supporting the Amendment by the fact, that under the hasty judgments that came to his own observation day by day in Courts of Law, most undesirable men might be thrown in amongst young people whom it was the intention of the Bill to reclaim. For that reason he was constrained to support a humane Amendment—the principle of which they had discussed upstairs. He was sorry he could not follow his hon. friend into the Lobby if he went to a division.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) regretted that the right hon. Gentleman, in giving the grounds on which he refused to accept this Amendment, should have given as his last reason for its rejection that the Bill as drafted would provide the authorities with all the cases they anticipated being able to deal with. That, of course, was a reason which it was extremely difficult, without a great deal of technical knowledge of the details and circumstances of the criminal classes in the country, for anyone to estimate. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that there would be within the ages of sixteen to twenty-one as many cases as he thought the authorities were likely to deal with.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he did not want to extend the area too much, in case there might be too many.

MR. CARLILE thought that was a very good ground. In moving this Amendment his hon. friend had in mind a desire to see the system extended, not as something which had not been tested, but as an institution which had been tested and had shown excellent results. Consequently, the Home Secretary was not now entering upon an undertaking which was purely experimental. Surely the authorities who had to deal with the imprisoning of a large number of criminals would, in any case, keep them in confinement in some sort of prison, and they might so adapt some of the convict stations and prisons that they might be able to take in a very considerable number largely in excess of what the right hon. Gentleman now proposed. Why should an application have to be made to the Home Secretary in every case, and why was it necessary to go through all that machinery? Surely the Judge might receive instructions from the Home Secretary to guide him in the selection of likely persons. Men changed in their tendency even among criminals at different periods of their lives. It did not follow that because a man was not reclaimable between sixteen and twenty-one he would be irreclaimable after that. It was often found in practice that prisoners were reclaimable at all periods of life. Why should this system, which was well known to be efficient and good, not be made applicable to persons above twenty-three years of age? He hoped his hon. and gallant friend would go to a division on this Amendment. He was sure that many hon. Members would feel that it was the right thing that this principle should be extended, and that the powers now given to the Home Secretary should permit of a considerable extension of the system. If this were done, the result would be that a vast amount of good would be done, and many men, whose lives would otherwise become permanently criminal, would be set upon the right path, and make good, healthy sound citizens. He begged to support the Amendment.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) urged, in regard to the objection that sending older people to the institution would interfere with the treatment of the younger, that the two classes might be received in different departments or prisons.

Amendment negatived.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to leave out the words "apparently under such age." This was really a drafting Amendment. He thought that was a simpler way of putting into the English language the desire of the Home Secretary. If this Amendment were adopted the right hon. Gentleman would have power to extend the system to people under the age of twenty-three. Why it was necessary to put in the words "apparently under such age," he did not know. He begged to move.

MR. CARLILE formally seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out the words 'apparently under such age.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*MR. GLADSTONE pointed out that cases could be dealt with if a person appeared to be under the age of twenty-one.

Sir F. BANBURY said the Home Secretary could not do anything if they were under the age of twenty-three.

*Mr. GLADSTONE said the provision was intended to give the power to the Court if a person appeared to be under the age of twenty-one.

Sir F. BANBURY asked what would happen supposing a person was over twenty-one when he was convicted.

*Mr. GLADSTONE replied that the Court had to decide whether a person appeared to be under twenty-one.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. GLADSTONE moved an Amendment in Clause 3 (power to transfer from prison to Borstal institution) providing that the Secretary of State may, in the case of a person sentenced to penal servitude or imprisonment "being within the limits of age within which persons may be detained in a Borstal institution," authorise the Prison Commissioners to transfer him from prison to a Borstal institution.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 31, after the word 'imprisonment,' to insert the words 'being within the limits of age within which persons may be detained in a Borstal institution.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. RAWLINSON said the Home Secretary's Amendment answered his point, and he should support it with his whole heart.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RAWLINSON said that Clause 4 gave power to the Home Secretary to establish Borstal Institutions in different parts of the country. The Amendment he proposed would limit those establishments to three in number. He thought the Home Secretary would be ready to admit that Borstal institutions were still in the experimental stage, for they had dealt with only about 200 cases, and, therefore, they had not gone very far up to the present. He thought they ought to proceed gently in giving a boundless discretion to the Home Office to extend and build a large number of these institutions before the experiment had been carried through satisfactorily. When one was pleased with a new work it was so easy to run into unnecessary expense in bricks and mortar, and his object in inserting this Amendment was that the Home Secretary should be allowed to build only three Borstal institutions. Of course the existing prisons could be used for this purpose, but the object of this Amendment was simply to limit the powers of the Home Secretary in regard to the creation of

Sir F. BANBURY seconded the Amendment. He said it was no consolation to the taxpayers when asked to find a large sum of money to be told that the Home Office had not spent much. He thought some limit should be put to the reckless expenditure which was going on. This was a new system, and it might be all right, but if it was found to work satisfactorily, it would be easy to bring a Bill to authorise the building of more institutions.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 40, after the word 'establish,' to insert the words 'three.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' be there inserted."

*Mr. GLADSTONE hoped the hon. Member would not press the Amendment. If the Borstal institutions were limited to three, what would be the result? Naturally that they would be abnormally large, and if they were, the very evil which the hon. Member anticipated would have to be faced. If this movement was to succeed, it would be a pity to limit it in any way. If it was to fail, the Amendment was unnecessary.

Mr. RAWLINSON asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RAWLINSON moved to leave out Clause 7, for the purpose of getting an explanation from the Home Secretary. It was a somewhat new departure that the Home Secretary with the approval of the Treasury should be allowed to give unlimited subscriptions to any private society, however desirable it might be. He was aware that grants were sometimes mysteriously made to private societies, and he had wondered under what power it was done.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 29, to leave out Clause 7."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the clause proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*MR. GLADSTONE said there was a precedent for what was proposed here. In this particular case he would remind the House that the most essential part of the Borstal system was what was known as the "after-care system," in connection with which immense labour was bestowed by those most excellent workers who looked after the class with whom they were dealing. The Treasury had sanctioned an annual grant of £500, which recently had been raised to £1,000 for this excellent purpose. It would hardly be worth while going on with the work unless some provision was made for a financial subsidy. He asked the House to pass the clause.

MR. RAWLINSON asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) moved to omit Part II. of the Bill, which deals with the detention of habitual criminals. He said he perfectly recognised that this was a futile task, because even if he were able to persuade hon. Members present—a number inconsiderable as compared with the number elsewhere—he knew that when the division bell rang those who were now absent would come in and overwhelm the votes of those who had heard the debate. He much regretted that the benches opposite were vacant when they were discussing this matter affecting the liberty of the subject. He could conceive no more grave invasion of what had been the unbroken constitutional practice in this country, with regard to the trial and sentencing of prisoners, than that which now emanated from a Liberal Government. With the details of the Bill he would not concern himself. What he was concerned with was the question of the inspiration of the measure. He did not know on what authority it was inspired. There was a proposal that it should be in the power of a chairman of quarter sessions to sentence to an indeterminate period of imprisonment, dependent on the good will of a prison warder, a man convicted three times of, possibly, a trivial offence over an almost unlimited period. That was a most startling proposition, and had no warranty in the criminal jurisprudence of this or any other country. Moreover, this indeterminate period of imprisonment could not be inflicted unless, as a condition precedent, a sentence of penal servitude was passed. The Bill, therefore, compelled the presiding Judge to pass a sentence of penal servitude which, but for his desire to inflict the indeterminate period, he would probably not pass. Certain preliminary safeguards had to be taken before a man could be charged with being an habitual criminal, and an absolute right of appeal was conceded. He had to be found to be an habitual criminal, and he was to be so found on evidence of reputation given by police officers, gaolers, and persons of that description—the most dangerous kind of evidence known to lawyers. He spoke from long experience, and he did not wish the House to understand that he regarded that evidence of no moment at all, but it was certainly not evidence which should have much, if any, weight attached to it for the purpose of imposing a sentence which was to entail such grave consequences as this part of the Bill contemplated. Assuming that the tribunal had not made a mistake, but had got hold of a goal-bird—in his comparatively small experience he had seen many persons who had alternated between the prison and the dock—he quite admitted that if human justice were infallible, and if human nature were capable of unerring judgment, it would be justifiable that such persons should be separated from their fellow creatures; but it was because he did not believe that human judgment was infallible that he objected to this proposal in the Bill. Assuming that the man had been rightly sentenced, where did he go to? He went to penal servitude for three, four, or five years or more, and after that penal servitude was over he still remained in penal servitude, although another name was given to it. Although the Home Secretary had chosen to say that the man might be confined in another part of the prison and under modified conditions, yet this man was to be kept in prison for ever—[AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!]—Yes, for ever, except that after a period of ten years it would be obligatory upon the Home Secretary to make a special report to Parliament. These reports to Parliament—he spoke from experience—were not worth the paper they were written upon; they were absolutely ineffective to assist Parliament to action. Assuming that the Home Secretary did his duty—he did not think any human being would suggest that the present Home Secretary, and he said this without any desire to flatter the right hon. Gentleman, did not do his duty—assuming that the Home Secretary strove his best to do his duty, this unhappy man would, while in prison, be subjected every six months to the torture of being brought before the board of visiting justices, inspired with the hope of the opportunity to escape being afforded him. On whose guidance, counsel and advice would the Home Secretary act? On the report of the Committee and the gaol authorities. The board of visitors would go to the prison, would talk to the prisoner, would accept or reject what they thought fit in his statements; but the real people who would give advice which would influence a decision would be the warders, the subordinate officials of the gaol, and upon their advice the Home Secretary might on licence discharge a prisoner undergoing preventive detention if satisfied that there was reasonable probability that he would not again engage in crime. That was sheer irony. All experienced prison officials would agree that the man most likely to be released from prison under this provision was not the sincerely contrite and penitent prisoner, but the hardened hypocrite, who was cunning enough to escape prison discipline, and was able to ingratiate himself with the warders. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman, did he really believe that there was any effective means available by which they could test whether a man was a reformed character or not? He noticed with some amusement some time ago a list of the marks for good conduct which had been obtained in a certain convict prison by certain notorious criminals and most dangerous ruffians, in the sense of their being the greatest danger and pests of society—men convicted as fraudulent trustees and directors of public companies. These were the men to ingratiate themselves with the prison officials, and who made themselves agreeable to the warders. They were removed into the hospital, or put playing the organ if they had musical ability, as many of them had. These were the men who earned the full number of marks, and of whom the Home Secretary would get good reports as well deserving to be let out on licence. He objected to giving to any human being, however high a judicial officer he might be—he should shrink from exercising any such function himself, and would regard it as a grievous burden—the right to confine another human being for the rest of his days on the arbitrament of the Home Secretary, acting on the initiative of prison warders. He maintained that the system embodied in this Bill was a new departure in the science of penology; it was an invasion on the principles of punishment which had been applied in any other civilised country. He felt very strongly on this matter, and although he did not anticipate that he should succeed in getting official support from that side of the House, he was sure that he would have the support of some hon. Members who considered that after all the good of the State was not the only thing to be taken into account, but justice to the individual. He begged to move.

*MR. BELLOC seconded the Amendment. Those who thought with his hon. and learned friend and himself wished, he said, to get rid of the principle underlying the second part of the Bill, and if possible expunged from other legislation. They considered it to be immoral and fraught with much serious danger in this and other departments of legislation. If he were asked why a Member of Parliament should oppose the second part of the Bill, he should reply—although many people might regard it as somewhat doctrinaire—it was because that without doubt if the provisions of the measure were clearly put before the English people they would be almost unanimously rejected. If the measure were made a first-class Bill it would be even more unpopular than was the Licensing Bill. In considering a measure of this kind, what was called a criminal class had to be pre-supposed. Whatever set of laws was made by the State, there was certainly a type of man likely to break these laws. The offences dealt with in this Bill were mainly offences against property, or minor offences which were morally petty, but the method of dealing with them imposed what the poor regarded as the worst pain which could be inflicted. He remembered during the Second Reading of the Bill that a Member of this House, who was also a member of what were called the governing families of this country, made some jokes about an old lady who stole some bacon, and he wondered what the noble Lord thought of those countries where they punished those who stole land? The noble Lord appeared to think that because an old lady who stole bacon was a nuisance, therefore there should be an arbitrary right to put her in confinement for a period which might perfectly well, if she were guilty of any violence, extend throughout her life. Then there was another point, so general that he was not sure how far it would carry conviction, though it was very plain and real to him. In this proposal they were cutting themselves apart, and for the first time, from the whole traditions of legislation, morals, and jurisprudence of civilised Europe. It was not an unimportant thing that for the first time, even in a small measure of this kind, they were turning their back upon what had been the theory of jurisprudence of this and every other civilised country. It seemed to him a matter of considerable doubt. There was a phrase as old as the Romans which said that a man "purged" his sin. A due punishment was weighed against his offence, and, after enduring it, he was free again, and a responsible citizen again. That conception had run through the whole of our morals and jurisprudence for 3,000 years, and it was at the bidding of pseudo-scientists with broken-down reputations like Lombroso's that they were going to turn their backs on the whole of that tradition. When he heard appeals to new countries—America, and the Colonies, and heaven knew where—he feared that the Members who used them had lost their sense of things European and traditional. The Bill would probably become law because there was not a single Member in this House, and not even in the other House, who could by any conceivable set of circumstances be inconvenienced by its proposals. Would any man who regarded these things lightly ask himself how his conscience stood in the matter of right and wrong? They of the well-to-do classes knew that they stood in little danger from the laws. If they could apply the indeterminate sentence to the type of evil which well-to-do men commit, there would be no chance of its passing into law in this House, and still less in the other. It was almost certain to pass into law, and that was why he spoke with violence. When it was passed into law they would have entered for the first time into that path which all modern pseudo-sociology was trying to force them into, at the end of which they had the tyranny of bureaucrats. He begged to second.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, to leave out Part II of the Bill."—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'whether' in page 5, line 7, stand part of the Bill."

*SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) said he made no apology to lawyers as a layman for taking part in a debate of this kind, because the Home Secretary, on the First Reading, said it was not for lawyers only but every layman was entitled to have a full voice in the new policy of this Bill. He gave the Second Reading of the Bill his support because of Part I. and he had hoped that Part II. would disappear or be modified. It would be remembered that this measure was introduced under the Ten Minutes Rule, read a second time at a Friday sitting, and then it went to the Standing Committee, where he gathered from *The Times* newspaper that there was great difficulty in keeping a quorum, as there were many interruptions by counts. Therefore, he thought this House ought to discuss fully this grave and important change which it was proposed to make in the criminal procedure of the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had distinguished between Part I. and Part II.; he said it—

> "undoubtedly raises new questions upon which there may be serious and, perhaps, strong differences of opinion."

He (Sir W. J. Collins) claimed to have had some experience in these matters, because he was on the board of visitors of a convict prison for five years, and became acquainted with the interior of such places. Under the Act of 1898 he opened the first certified inebriate reformatory of the London County Council, and he also visited the Aylesbury State Reformatory and the asylums of the London County Council for ten years or more. He, therefore, had had some opportunity of studying this question of recidivism in criminals, and he would give the House his experience as a humble student of criminology. He agreed with the mover of the Amendment that it was desirable to know whence had come the proposal which they were now discussing. What was the genesis and origin of this Part II. of this Prevention of Crimes Bill? It had been stated in previous debates that the origin of this Part II. was the result of the Report of a certain Committee which sat in 1894, but he would ask the House to compare what it recommended with the provisions of this measure. The recommendation of the Committee of 1894 contemplated the—

> "Segregation of habituals for long periods of detention, during which they would not be treated with the severity of hard labour or penal servitude, but would be forced to work under less onerous conditions."

They did not advocate penal servitude first, with detention afterwards, but less onerous conditions from the first; in other words, they regarded these criminals, not as incorrigibles, but as having some hope of redemption. They did not recommend eternal damnation or indefinite detention at the pleasure of the Home Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman said, with regard to these criminals, that hope and not fear was the best antidote to criminal habits, and he was bound to say from what he had observed of those undergoing penal servitude, that their eager hope was to get release, but if they were to have the penal servitude to expiate the crime first and an additional indeterminate detention at the end of it, he thought it would engender not hope but despair, and the words of Coleridge would apply—

> "Work without hope draws nectar in a sieve,
> And hope without an object cannot live."

He thought that this would be the result of this additional preventive detention which they too would have to forward to. He should have thought it was a case of—

> "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

What was the origin of this plan? It would be found, not in the Reports of any independent Committee, but it emanated from prison officials, and would be found in the Report of the Prison Commission of 1901–1902. He knew what good work the Chairman of that Commission had done, but he thought he was undoing it by the Amendments he had pressed upon the Home Office. These were the results of the Reports of a bureaucratic Commission, and not of any independent inquiry. It was said to be easy to draw the line between the mad and the bad, but he ventured to submit that it was exceedingly difficult to do so. Those who took cognisance of these matters recognised a large class of borderland cases where it was difficult to say if the people were mad or bad. He recalled the case of a woman who had had numerous short sentences in Holloway and graduated thence to a certified reformatory and thence to the State Reformatory where, after repeated confinement in the punishment cell, diet punishment and straight waistcoat, she was reported to be insane and sent to an asylum where the medical officer reported—

> "She has been extremely morose since her admission here, and puts one in mind of a wild animal at bay. Last night she attempted suicide in a very determined manner by tying some thread tightly round her throat. If asked to give a name to her mental condition, I should be inclined to describe it as moral

insanity and suicidal impulse, and I think the prognosis is very unfavourable."

These cases of moral insanity he thought our system failed entirely or very largely to weed out from our prisons. In all cases of reclamation or in any system of the allotment of rewards and punishments, they must postulate the existence of a will amenable to such influences as were brought to bear in the process of reclamation, amenable, that is, to the ordinary motives of conduct. Unless one had the co-operation of the individual one was really fishing in fishless waters in attempting to get any man or woman to improve. He was not surprised to hear the Home Secretary say that anything was better than the present system, because in the Committee upstairs the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "The prison authorities now had no responsibility for the prisoner's moral condition or future welfare put upon them by law, and they were not bound to turn him out a better man than he went in."

Under these circumstances one was not surprised that 50 per cent. returned again, when no effort was made to turn a man out better than when he went in. But a far more important matter was the aspect of the mental condition of these persons. The Home Secretary himself said, when this question was raised on Second Reading, that many of these persons were mentally deficient.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Not the class we are dealing with in this Bill.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS said the right hon. Gentleman said they made a distinction between "habituals" and "professionals."

*MR. GLADSTONE said he quite agreed. They made a distinction, but they distinguished, not as regarded their state of mind, but with regard to the class of crime committed. The class his hon. friend designated committed mostly the small offences, petty larceny, small depredation, and were generally vagrants. He particularly said that that was not the class they were dealing with under this Bill.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS referred the right hon. Gentleman to the Report of the Prisons Commission, which stated that with regard to Parkhurst Prison many persons had been found insane, after many months of imprisonment, against whom every class of crime was recorded. It was true, as the right hon. Gentleman had said on the Second Reading, that this question of mental deficiency was a great problem, and ought to be dealt with; but, continued the right hon. Gentleman, they could not deal with it under this Bill. They would have to await the Report of the Royal Commission on the Feeble-minded before they could deal with it. Since the Second Reading, that Commission had reported, and he found in the pages of that Report ample corroboration of what he had been saying. That Report teemed with evidence that showed that even under the present system there were many cases besides those who were certified as insane who were mentally defective and not amenable to prison discipline. They say—

> "At the house of detention a large proportion are feeble-minded or lunatic. Of these weak-mindeds (according to Dr. Scott) a number are sent to prison. . . . Many who are only partially responsible are punished . . . this complicates the administration of justice."

The same is true at Pentonville—

> "Dr. Parker Wilson said that in that prison about 100 prisoners a year were so far mentally afflicted as to be quite unfit for prison discipline. . . . Besides these there are not less than 20 per cent. of the prisoners who show signs of mental inefficiency."

And again, as Dr. Smalley says—

> "Though the less grave forms of crime predominate, there is a potentiality in the feeble-minded class for crimes of a more serious character; many are eventually sent into penal servitude."

He could quote page after page to the same effect, but he would only give one more quotation. The authors of the Report were perfectly familiar with the Home Office Rules, and the Report said—

> "These regulations, good as they are, do not suffice. The conditions of committal and discharge will have to be altered if remedial reforms are to be made. . . . In regard to those committed to convict prisons the same evils obtain . . . here they are treated as this reiterated evidence shows, without hope and without purpose. . . . This is an evil of the very greatest magnitude."

And they recommend that Courts of Justice should be empowered—

> "To order the detention of a convicted mentally defective person in a suitable insti-

tution instead of pronouncing a sentence of imprisonment."

That justified the statement that he had made, that very little discrimination took place to find out those who were bad and those who were mad. He deeply regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have associated his honoured name with this portion of the Bill. It was not an advance in the direction of ameliorating prison conditions, but was tending to undo the great work done by John Howard and Sir Samuel Romilly, and he should go into the lobby against it.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said as he had been in his past life an habitual criminal he took some interest in this question, and he was bound to say he could not understand how any English House of Commons could for a moment entertain such a proposal to leave the liberty of these unfortunate people at the mercy of the Judge. The proposal that they should be detained for an unlimited period was a scandalous and retrograde one and absolutely inconsistent with the trend of modern legislation. He had often noticed the want of due appreciation among people generally as to the punishment it was for a human being to be deprived of his liberty. It was often regarded as a very slight matter in this House, whereas it was in fact a terrible punishment. No matter how humanely they might treat the prisoners, the very fact that they were not at liberty but were locked in cells under the orders of warders and were compelled to forfeit the sunlight and air, the freedom which the poorest tramp enjoyed, was a very great punishment indeed. He had known people in England and Ireland express surprise that the poor preferred to sleep out in the open rather than submit to the restraint of workhouses, and he did not wonder at that, because of all the privileges that man enjoyed in this world the dearest was that of liberty. He said, having endured it himself, that there were few punishments more severe than that of living under the direction of other men, unable to leave a room 8 feet by 4 feet for hours in the day without getting permission to do so. It was a terrible thing to invite a Judge to deprive a human being of his liberty for an indefinite period, not only on account of the offence for which he was charged, but because of some police record of his past—a record which was often exceedingly false, because those unfortunate people, who were more or less outcasts of society, were in a most indefensible position with regard to the record of their past lives and very much at the mercy of the police. When one was imprisoned, his mind naturally fixed itself upon the hope of release. The one redeeming consideration in the term of imprisonment was that there was a term to it and that the prisoner's mind was always working in the consideration that he might get out; and the most humane provision was the power given to the prisoner to earn a shortening of his sentence. It was now proposed, lightly and without grounds, to take away that one gleam of hope. It was proposed that there should be indefinite preventive detention after the sentence of penal servitude or imprisonment. Of course, he might hope sooner or later, before he died, that the Home Secretary would let him out if he behaved well; but there was no definite time at which he had the right to get out. That appeared to him to be a most extraordinary exacerbation and increase of the punishment of imprisonment. He would point out also the crimes for which a man or woman might be sentenced to this preventive detention. The expression "crime," the Bill said, meant in England and Ireland any felony, or offence of uttering counterfeit coin, or getting goods or money by false pretences, or offences of conspiracy to defraud, or any misdemeanour under Section 58 of the Larceny Act. That extended, he presumed, to petty larceny and small offences; and for these small, petty offences an unfortunate wretch might be sentenced to this preventive system, during which time he was to be subjected to the same treatment as under penal servitude or ordinary imprisonment. There was nothing at any rate to ensure that he would not be. He was bound to say that the present treatment in the gaols of this country was, in his opinion, a great reproach to the

Government of the country. They were accustomed to find fault, and be extremely critical of Russia, France, and other foreign countries; but it was his deliberate conviction—and at one period of his life he had opportunities of obtaining information on the subject—that, on the whole,the prisoners of most European countries, including Russia, were far better treated than the prisoners of this country. He did not say that in most cases the prisons were so sanitary, because he would say that the prisons of England and Ireland were kept in an extremely sanitary condition and that the death-rate had been reduced to an exceedingly low point; but, so far as the mental sufferings of the inmates was concerned, he believed the Russian system was infinitely superior. There was more association and less of that awful system of shutting a man up for a year and not allowing him to speak to his fellow men—a system which, in his opinion, was largely responsible for those cases of semi-lunacy. It took a very strong mind to undergo imprisonment in this country for a prolonged period and remain sane. There were many men who had gone into prison perfectly sane and who had emerged from it semi-insane after some years of this suffering. This was, therefore, in his opinion, a retrograde clause which ought not to have been introduced into a Bill which had for its main object the reform of the prison system. He was a great believer in the possibility of so reforming the prison system—and he believed it was the duty of everybody to endeavour so to reform it—that it might not only be punitive but curative. The main object of prisons ought to be curative rather than punitive. He did not go so far as great thinkers such as Tolstoi who held it a great crime to imprison any man. He believed it was sometimes a duty to society to do so, but society owed prisoners a duty scientifically to adjust the system so that as far as possible it might be curative. The system at present was not curative; it was a maddening system. The first thing they ought to do was, not to give their invitation to Judges to pass indefinite sentences, but to humanise the whole system and turn the prisons into something more than places of restraint. He remembered once going into the great prison of New York. There were more than a thousand prisoners there. They were engaged in useful labour, associated together like rational human beings, though no doubt they were watched by armed guards and every precaution was taken to prevent any outbreak of violence. If anyone offended he was quite propsrly removed to the disciplinary prison. They were all leading rational and human lives, associated and working together during many hours of the day. He came away from that prison without the impresion of horror which was left after an investigation of our solitary confinement system. It was a pity that in a Bill of this character such a retrograde clause should be inserted.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he had listened with great interest to the speeches that had been made. With regard to the hon. and learned Member for Durham, his speech was in all respects a travesty of what was proposed by the Bill. He had drawn a picture of a retired grocer as Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, without any check, ruthlessly sending one prisoner after another for indeterminate detention, but he omitted to tell the House how many restrictions there were upon that. The hon. Member for Salford did not leave him much to answer, because, as he said, he did not concern himself with details. He said only criminals were competent to deal with great subjects of criminal jurisprudence.

MR. BELLOC: I do not think I ever said anything as silly as that in my life.

*MR. GLADSTONE was sorry if he had misrepresented the hon. Member, but he understood him to say that no Member of that House or of another place was in the least competent to deal with the question, seeing that not a single Member in either House had any chance of personal experience of what was provided. He thought that was the disqualification in the hon. Member's mind, but he passed from that. The last two speeches that they had heard had been distinguished for one thing above all others, and that was that they had denounced and criticised in the most ruthless terms the present system of penal servitude and imprisonment. He agreed with them to a considerable extent, and it was because he agreed with his hon. friends that the Government had brought in this Bill. He maintained that the Bill was in no sense what the hon. Member for East Mayo described it to be. It was right enough to say that the one great element of hope in the mind of the prisoner was the thought of release. That was why the Government had brought in the Bill in the form in which it was, and also because they wished to see the man who was committed to this indeterminate detention have constantly in his mind the prospect of release as soon as he gave satisfactory assurance that he was ready to lead an honest life, and that he had in his own hand the key of his own release. He was afraid the hon. Member had not read the Bill all through, and hoped he had not altogether made up his mind. He maintained, in the first instance, that the policy of long, fixed sentences had absolutely broken down in this country. That was his first position. He would give a few typical cases of the kind of man they had in their mind, and with whom the system would deal. A., thirty-eight years of age, received his first conviction at twenty-five; had served sentences of two and six years penal servitude for forgery; now undergoing ten years for the same offence; time actually spent in prison, seven and a half years; a well-educated man, a professional forger. B., forty-five years of age, received his first conviction at twenty-nine; served three terms of penal servitude and eleven sentences for stealing; now undergoing three years penal servitude for stealing and receiving; eleven and a half years in prison. C., forty years of age, received first conviction at twenty-seven; served thirteen sentences for stealing and housebreaking; now serving five years for larceny; nine years actually in prison. D., thirty-one years of age; first conviction, eighteen; served nineteen sentences for stealing and shopbreaking; now serving three years penal servitude for stealing; seven and a half years in prison. These were no ordinary cases. They were not men who had fallen into crime in their youth, who were bred up among evil surroundings. Except the last man, they began their criminal career when nearly thirty years old, and then took to it professionally. As they took to it, so, if they chose, they could leave it. How were they to deal with them? Were they going to continue the ridiculous system as it existed now, founded on retaliation, to which the hon. Member for Salford seemed wedded—the long fixed sentence of ten, fifteen or twenty years, the slow dragging time that crushed a man, body and soul, with no prospect of release, till the end of the fixed period with no hope in him but dull savage determination when he came out to have his revenge, so far as he could, on society? He agreed that they ought to fight against the notion that there was a class of stereotyped criminal who must exist whatever they did; and what they had to do was to try to stop crime at its source, as they had done in the Probation Act and in the Children Act, and as they proposed to do in part of this Bill. But as things were, they had a large number of men who were professional criminals, with no intention of being anything else unless proper coercion, or proper reformation, was applied. What was the present system? How could there be any true relation between the measure of a man's guilt and the measure of the suffering and the punishment which he endured under a fixed sentence? What justice was there in it? It was tragic in its effect on prisoners. If they came to short sentences—he was speaking now of this distinct class—what good did it do? These men laughed at it. The present system was cruel and dangerous—cruel because under these fixed sentences it gave no hope to a man, and it gave no incentive to the prison authorities to use the best means to reclaim them. It was dangerous because it was ineffective. Recidivism was increasing notwithstanding the spread of education. In 1903, out of 2,041 prisoners, 73·9 per cent. were previously convicted; in 1908, out of 2,376 prisoners, 82 per cent. were previously convicted. This class was increasing. In dealing with this class the present system was a failure. It did not reform them, and was cruel. It was important the House should bear in mind that this new institution—he would not call it a prison—was to be different and distinct from prisons as they now existed. Technically it would be a prison in that prison rules and forcible detention would apply, but in its working it would be essentially different. It would be built in a different and selected type on a site specially suitable, on a design carefully and specially thought out, and its inmates were to be treated in a special manner. It was urged against the Bill that its worst part was that it proposed that a man should first go through a sentence of penal servitude. The reason for the preliminary sentence was that this new institution was to be different in its whole spirit from the ordinary prison. His design was that it should be a place for reformation as well as of detention. If a place of that sort was organised, it was necessary it should be kept from some of the characteristics of the ordinary prison life. If there was no preliminary sentence, and a man taken in some horrible or disgusting offence, some brutal robbery with violence were sent straight into it, it would ruin the whole conception of the place. He would go in red hot from crime, without any period for reflection, and, perhaps, with the determination to make things as unpleasant as possible. It was necessary, therefore, that these men should go first for a period of detention in prison. The man would have to be punished for the crime of which he was convicted. It was necessary that a man should first undergo a period of penal servitude. That had been the opinion in the Colonies where the indeterminate system had been adopted. Three of the Australian Colonies had adopted the indeterminate sentences preceded by a period of imprisonment. It was necessary that the man should recognise clearly the distinction between the punitive period in a convict prison and detention in the reforming institution. This period of detention would last as long as the man persisted in his intention to lead a criminal life. If he gave reasonable undertaking that he meant to turn over a new life and lead a life of honest work, he would have a chance of carrying out his intention at the end of one, two, or three years; that he could settle for himself. And it was important to remember that the preliminary period of imprisonment would have an important bearing on the man's future. During that period he might by his conduct earn remission, the Home Secretary could shorten the period and by good behaviour he would have an earlier transfer to the detention institution. That was to take the place of the present system—doing time, that hateful phrase, with reversion to crime at the end of it. Under the Bill the man would know when he entered prison that he would afterwards go into detention and would be detained until he gave reasonable guarantee that he would turn over a new leaf.

MR. DILLON: How can the man give a guarantee?

*MR. GLADSTONE said he would deal with that point later. At the moment he was trying to link up the two forms of detention. In the convict prison the offender would recognise facts, he would understand that the State, having got hold of him, would not allow him to revert to his life of crime, he would recognise his position, and though it could not be said that all would do so, certainly a great number would see, either through awakening of conscience or working of reason, that it would be to their interest, that it would pay them better to give up crime and try to settle to honest ways of life. Therefore, he hoped he had made clear that the period of preliminary imprisonment and the period of the indeterminate detention must be taken together and worked together. It might be said: "How do you deal with the criminal who has been sentenced to a long term of penal servitude? It is a monstrous thing that a man who may have been sentenced to ten or fifteen years penal servitude should have to undergo an indeterminate term of detention after that." He agreed there might be a danger. He did not for a moment think that such a harsh sentence would be imposed. If such an extreme case happened it would be perfectly easy for the Home Secretary to adjust the matter if it required adjustment. But what would the Judges do? The Judges, he was sure, would administer the Act wisely and well. In the case of a man who had three records against him and was convicted of the fourth qualifying offence, the Judge would not proceed to sentence him forthwith; the prisoner would be further charged with recidivism, and if he were found guilty of that by the jury the Judge would then pronounce sentence. The Judge in imposing that sentence would obviously have regard to the whole case and to the prisoner's character and record. If he thought the man were more sinned against than sinning the Judge would make his penal servitude short, so that he might soon reach the indeterminate period, and so obtain an early release. Safeguards were provided against the harsh working of the Bill. In the first place the Public Prosecutor had to sanction any proceedings, and to that provision he attached great importance. He would tell the House why. That provision would avoid the danger to the individual which might result from a zealous policeman who was too eager to proceed against some inconvenient person in the locality, and who did not take enough trouble to find out whether he was a man who ought to be treated in the way proposed. The duty of finding out would be put on the Public Prosecutor who would have to satisfy himself carefully as to previous records and as to whether the person concerned was a proper subject for being dealt with in this way. His hon. friend the Member for West St. Pancras seemed to think that half-witted people, those on the road to insanity, would be put into these places without any restrictions. That would not be so at all. Precautions would be taken against prisoners who were mentally deficient being dealt with under this part of the Bill as habitual offenders.

Sir W. J. COLLINS asked if the measure provided for any improvement in the present arrangements for ascertaining whether a prisoner was mentally deficient.

*Mr. GLADSTONE said it was impossible to provide in set terms for the particular medical examination that each individual should receive; but his hon. friend might take it from him—and he spoke, not only for himself, but for the Office which he represented and for the Prison Commissioners—that all engaged in the administration of the Act would in each case of the indictment of a person for being an habitual offender carefully look into it from the point of view of the character of the man. The personality and the circumstances of the accused man would be considered. No mentally-deficient person would be placed in the category of the habitual offenders. Such cases would at once be brought to the notice of the proper officials, who would take care that they received the best treatment that could be given in the circumstances. Let the House also remember that in addition to the safeguard through the Public Prosecutor, the jury had to be satisfied that the man was an habitual offender. The Judge had to be satisfied, likewise, and in the background there was the Home Secretary who would exercise in this, as in other cases, the prerogative of mercy. The man had also an unqualified right of appeal. Then if Clauses 12 to 14 were carefully looked at, it would be seen that it was the duty of all concerned so to treat these people that they should be discharged as soon as they were capable of earning an honest livelihood; and that when they were discharged on licence they were put under supervision, personal or of some society, so that when they left prison they would get a lift which would induce them not to go back to criminal associations, as now happened. Subsection (2) of Clause 12 made it mandatory on the Secretary of State to discharge a prisoner at the expiration of ten years unless he had definite reason to believe, on information given by the police, that the prisoner would relapse into crime. He would remind the House that if they were going to undertake a work of this kind they should make it complete. He maintained on the authority of many criminologists in America and elsewhere, that the fact of there being an indeterminate period of detention was of great assistance in steadying down hardened offenders. Some men if they knew there was a fixed date for release would persist in defiance of reformatory influences. They should know from the first that persistency in criminal intent can be of no avail. He wished to hasten the process of reformation. He did not suppose that this power of enforcing an indeterminate sentence would be used except in rare and exceptional circumstances. He did not believe that these men would stay in prison for more than three or four years, but, supposing that there were some prisoners who knew that they must go out at the end of ten years, and who pretended that if they were allowed to go free, that they would live an honest life and not go back to their old game of forgery or housebreaking, they might only do so in order to have six months or a year of the old life which they thought was much greater fun than being honest. Suppose that was known —and such things did get known in prison—there ought to be some power to detain these men in prison instead of allowing them to go free. The House would remember that when special cases arose these would be laid before Parliament. He had every reason to know from personal experience that these cases were taken notice of in Parliament. Having regard to the practical necessity of keeping these men in prison, this one small reservation was advisable. The House could be satisfied that in fact the Act would compel them to release these men as soon as they possibly could. It had been said that there was no guarantee for milder treatment under this new system. All he could say was that they bound themselves to what he had said in the House; and he called attention to the Amendments which he had put on the Paper to insert at the end of Clause 11 to the following effect: "Persons undergoing preventive detention shall be subjected to such disciplinary and reformative influences, and shall be employed on such work as may be best fitted to make them able and willing to earn an honest livelihood on discharge." They were going to establish a different system. His hon. friend the Member for West St. Pancras had quoted words which he had used upstairs in Committee, with regard to our present prison system and the responsibility upon prison warders and officials. Their obligation now was to keep the prisoners under detention, but there was no obligation upon them to reform them, and the average man shapes his conduct according to the duties and responsibilities put upon him. These officials were very often very kind friends to the prisoner; many a kindly act even of a warder had been of great use to a prisoner, but there was no system in it at all. It was a system of rigid detention modified by the recent provision of progressive stages and remission for good conduct. They intended that the higher responsible staff in this new institution should be specially trained to new work, and their work would not only be judged by their success in keeping people under detention, but by their success in discharging them week by week, month by month, and year by year. Active work would be done by the special committee and others concerned for training and reforming the prisoners, so that at the earliest moment these men, trained to work, might be found capable of having their discharge and, under proper supervision, having every opportunity of becoming honest men. That was the great and vital distinction between the two institutions. Passing to the question of how they would know when to discharge these men, he said that the prison authorities often did know when a man ought to be discharged. He knew cases of men in regard to whom the prison governor could say: "That man will never commit another offence." He had heard that from them himself.

MR. PICKERSGILL said that in quite a number of cases it was a mistake.

*MR. GLADSTONE said it was so, for they were all liable to mistakes, but they had to exercise the best judgment they could. There were many cases of doubt, and as regards these they had to take their chance.

MR. DILLON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman really defended this proposition that the liberty of a man was left at the mercy of another man's opinion of his acts.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that, put in that way, of course the question did not admit of an affirmative answer, but he might point out that the Home Secretary on the advice of a single individual under the present system could release a man.

MR. DILLON pointed out that he could release a man, but he could not prolong his imprisonment.

*Mr. GLADSTONE urged that surely this was a merciful provision, this power of release, and the fact that they could release on licence enabled them to release earlier. If they could not release on licence they would not be able to release if they were in a state of doubt. Supposing one was in a state of doubt, was it not perfectly fair to say to a man who had been an outlaw against society: "If you will give me this guarantee, I will let you out on licence earlier than I would if I had not the power to release you on licence"? Was it not fair, and was it not a merciful way of acting? He should think it was better than fixed imprisonment, of which hon. Members were so much in favour. They were adopting a merciful system which would enable a man to turn over a new leaf, and setting up machinery to keep him straight in any path that he had chosen. He apologised to the House for occupying them so long They proposed to put the process of regeneration within the power of these men. They were to have the key of their own release. If they would consent to become honest men they would be let out on licence. Was that wrong, harsh, or cruel, or a reactionary step? If this was what an hon. Member called a reactionary step, he would take it, but it was not reactionary. It was, he said, a step in the right direction, and he believed that this method of dealing with criminals would be found the chief secret of prison reform. They did not attempt to deal with the whole of prison reform in this Bill; this was an instalment, and the experiment would be watched carefully by the whole of the world wherever interest was taken in these matters. It was because he believed that the Bill was merciful to criminals many of whom would reform if given an opportunity, that he asked this House to reject the Amendment.

Mr. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) said the House had listened with very great interest to the exhaustive speech of the right hon. Gentleman and he thought it had done so with a good deal of sympathy with what he said, but at that late hour he did not intend to give a detailed criticism of the measure or to examine the argument of the right hon. Gentleman in support of it. What he rose to do was to suggest that in view of the lateness of the hour the debate might be now adjourned, because it was obviously not a proper time of the night to enter upon a detailed discussion of so important a measure. The right hon. Gentleman would remember that they only began discussion of the Bill at a late hour, 9.30, whereas it was hoped to have taken it at an earlier hour of the evening, and he thought it was not at all the fault of those Members on the Opposition side of the House that they were prevented from carrying out the arrangement which had been arrived at. He did not think it was necessary for him to labour the point any further and he would simply move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr, Henry Forster.*)

*Mr. GLADSTONE said he of course recognised the fact that the beginning of the debate was made later than was anticipated by the prolongation of discussion of the Scottish Education Bill, but he might point out that there was full discussion on the Second Reading, when all these matters were discussed at very considerable length, whilst he would respectfully suggest that not much more time was necessary to discuss the particular Amendment under consideration. But having regard to the feeling expressed by the hon. Member opposite, and to the fact that he himself had taken up a very considerable portion of time, he should not like to press the House to sit longer, and therefore accepted the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 25th November, 1908.

The Lord Cranworth took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

Petition of Messrs. Rees and Freres, of 5, Victoria Street, Westminster, Parliamentary Agents, praying for leave to present a petition of owners and ratepayers in the borough of Hanley, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such petition has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table, and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered To-morrow in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour of; Of Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Carlos Bay, Newquay, Fenton, Birtley, Chartershaugh, Brecon Hill, Bromley Road, Hanwood; Temperance Meeting, Moss Side, Manchester; Wesley Guild, Ilford; Sunday School Teachers, Brentwood; Church Officers and Sunday School, Argyle Street, Hull; Officers, West Parade Mission, Hull; Officers and Members, Providence Row Mission, Hull; Teachers and Officers of Sunday School, Grosvenor Street, Hull; Bible Class, Walthown Street, Hull; Sunday School, Princes Avenue, Hull; Wesley Guild, Princes Avenue, Hull; Trustees, Stewards, etc., Princes Avenue, Hull; Temperance Meeting, Society Class, Wesleyan Methodist Mission, and Sunday School, Hamilton Place, Hull; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Wesley Guild, and Sunday School, Beverley Road, Hull; Free Church Council, Sunday School Teachers, Leaders and Stewards, Wesley Guild, and Trustees, Wesleyan Church, Hebburn; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Knight Street, Jarrow, and Bolton Colliery; Officers, Wesleyan Church, Hebburn Colliery; Officers, Wesleyan Church, Argyle Street, Hebburn; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Overthorpe; Band of Hope, Fern Hill, Salop; Wesleyan Mission, Broad Ma Hall, Bristol; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Brontrewyn Talsarnan; Wesley Churches at Carew, Penmaer; Wesley Guild, Takingates; Brotherhood, Norton, Stockton-on-Tees; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Dilhorn; Wesley Guild, Park Road, Newcastle; Band of Hope, Bolton; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Danley, Salop; Welsh Wesleyan Churches at Kidwelty, Hesenon Bembrey; Temperance Society, Newport, Isle of Wight; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Shorwill; Wesley Guilds at Newport, Isle of Wight; Finsbury Park; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Etrington Street, Plymouth; Brotherhood and Sunday School at Conway Road, Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Steyne Gardens, Worthing, Trinity, Paddington; Band of Hope, Lancing; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Shoreham; Sunday School, South Bank, Middlesbrough; Wesleyan Methodist Church, South Bank; Wesley Guild, Leigh; Band of Hope, Wellington; Leaders Meeting, Tadcaster; Free Churches, Grassington, York; Wesley Guild, Horden, Sunderland; Men's Bible Class, Sidcup; Band of Hope, Kingsley, Cheadle; Wesley Bible Class, Baptist Mills, Bristol; Temperance Committee, Fartown; Sunday School, Fartown; Band of Hope, Fartown; Local Preachers Meeting, Queen's Street, Huddersfield; Sunday School, Rowley Hill; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Rowley Hill; Sunday School, Upperheaton; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Upperheaton; Band of Hope, Upperheaton; Sunday School, Houses Hill; Mutual Improvement Society, Dartmouth; Wesley Guild and Wesleyan Methodist Church, Tynemouth; Wesley Guild and Wesleyan Methodist Church, Clarendon Park; Wesleyan Mission, Mansfield Street; Wesleyan Institute, Bishop Street; Wesleyan School, The Glen; Missionary Meeting, Glen Magna; Mission Service, Bread Street; Men's Bible Class and Sunday School, Clarendon Park; Sunday School Teachers, Ayleston Park; Wesleyan Congregation, Bread Street; Two Senior Classes, Clarence Hall; Society Class, Llanishen; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Ebbw Vale and Beaufort; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Cardiff; Wesley Guild's District Council, Cardiff; Brotherhood and Sisterhood, Sheffield; Good Templars Sub-Conference, Houghton-le-Spring; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Philadelphia, Durham; Band of Hope, New Bury, Farnworth; Brotherhood, Albert Hall, Nottingham; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Victoria Hall, Nottingham; Society Class, Montford Bridge; Bands of Hope at Rilla Mill and Venterdon; Adult Bible Class, Frankwell, Shrewsbury; Society Classes at Montford Bridge and Morton Mill; Wesleyan Churches at Keswick and Cockermouth; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Dalton-in-Furness and Barrow-in-Furness; Mission Service, Wesleyan Methodist Church, and Public Conference, Whitehaven; Men's Bible Class, Whitehaven; Wesleyan Methodist Church, North Street, Nottingham; Temperance and Band of Hope Committee, Manchester; Wesley Guild, Cheadle Holme; Women's Temperance Association, Manchester; Central Hall Service, Eccles, Manchester; Sunday School and Band of Hope, Trinity, Eccles; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Longsight, Manchester; Sunday School, Ely; Wesley Guild, Clare Garden, Glamorgan; Sunday School, Clare Gardens, Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Ely; Sunday School and Band of Hope and Wesleyan Society, Ludlow Street, Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Pelton Fell; Sunday School, Ivybridge; Brotherhood and Sisterhood, Ebenezer, Sheffield; Temperance Society, King Street, Hammersmith; Wesley Guild, Victoria Road, Southsea; Congregational Church, Ebenezer, Uppermill; Congregational Church, Dobcross, Saddleworth; Men's Class, Delph; Local Preachers, Saddleworth; Wesley Guild, Upper Mill; Wesleyan MethodistChurches at Hartland and Kirkampton; Gospel Temperance Society and Wesley Guild at Ivybridge; Executive of Wesley Guild, Manvers Street, Trowbridge; Wesley Guild, Market Rasen, Lincolnshire; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Padstow, Sydenham; Wesley Guilds at Helperton, Wesley Road, Trowbridge, Ridgway, Plympton; Sunday School Teacher's Convention, Woodford; Seven Kings; Wesley House Chapel, Romford; Cranbrook Park; Wesleyan Church, Ilford; Wesleyan Church, Cotham; Wesleyan Church, Beckenham; Wesleyan Methodists, West London Mission; Whitchurch; Dartford; Wesleyan Methodists, Banbury; Porth; Ferndale; Woodhouse, Sheffield; Warmington, Banbury; Wesleyan Methodists Huddersfield; Wesleyan Circuit, Swansea; Public Meetings at Bolingey, Weston-super-Mare, Ellesmere Road, Sheffield; Rechabites, Leicester; Porthleven, Cornwall, Chester-le-Street, Hetton-le-Hole, Roupell Park, Brant Broughton, Haworth, Conisborough, Sheffield, Ecclesfield, Sheffield, St. Alban's Road, Market Street, Bristol, Bridlington, Regent Road, Salford, Regent Road, Manchester, Central Hall, Manchester, Mostyn Road, S.W., Langwir Priory Road, Wilford Haven, Plumstead Hall, Woolwich, Cadishead, Manchester, Congleton, Rhyl, Quay, Marazion, St. Denis, St. Agnes, Regurced, Oswaldtwistle, Rishton, Forest Gate, E., St. Columb, St. Newlyn, Stow-on-the-Wold, Upper Mill, Laddleworth, Spilsby, Moseley Road, Birmingham, St. Alban's, Cottingham, Market Harborough, Trustees, Cottingham, Market Harborough, West Streatham, S.W., Durham Road, Sunderland, North Hill, Trevadlock Cross, Audley, Stafford, Easington Lane, County Durham, Statheon, Commercial Road, Steburn, West Heslerton, South London Mission, Maryport, Fothergill, Flimby, Netherton, Gilcrux, Mowbray, Broughton Moor, Flimby, Aspatrix, Baldhu, Zelah, St. Day, Frogpool, Cavdynham, Truro, Shildon, Riseburn, Heighington, St. Merryn, Upper Tooting, S.W., Lune Street, Preston, Hackney Wick, N.W., Temperance Union, Rochdale, East Street Portswood, Bevers Town, Bitterne Park, Staniland, Halifax, Silverstone, Leonard Stanley, New Barnet, Hazel Grove, Barnes Square, Clayton-le-Moors, Milwall, Poplar (2), Granby, Minehead, Sutton Bonington, Chester Moor, Mawgan, Gweek Helstone, Constantine, Waltham Abbey, Cross Street, Market Drayton, Braunton, Helstone, Cheadle, Hales, Clapham, Dewsbury, Marble Arch, Hyde Park, Pitt Street, Rotherhithe, E., Salisbury, Leicester, Sheffield, Rishton, Grays, Whitehaven, Sale, Cross Bank, Padiham, Woodford, Churches, Public Meetings, Temperance Societies, etc., at the following places: Aberavon, Port Talbot, Abersychan, Accrington, Adwalton, Audenshaw, Hooley Hall, Armley, Steaker Lane, Arreton, Isle of Wight, Barnsley (2), Barry, Batley (2), Beeston, Beighton, Bellingham, Benwell, Bere Alston, Devon, Birdwell, Bishop Auckland, Bishopstoke, Blackheath (2), Bishopstoke Common, Blaenavon, Bolton (2), Boston, Bradford (3), Bristol, Bury, Cammelford, Canning Town, E., Castlemere, Chorley, Churchill, Cwmtylery, Colne, Connah's Quay, Coombewater, Cowes (2), Cowling, Crosshills, Crosslanes, Dalton-in-Furness, Dalwood, Devon, Darlington, Darwin, Lower, Diss, Derby, Downham Market, Drybrook, Dunston-on-Tyne, Eccleshill, Bradford, Egremont, Featherstone, Yorkshire, Forest Hill S.E., Frodsham, Fulwell, Durham, Garndiffaith, Gateshead, Gillingham, Great Harwood (2), Hedge End, Hartlepool, Helsby, Herodsfoot, Higginshaw, High Southwick, High Town, Holt, Hove, Hull, Heywood, Kensington West, Kingsley, Cheshire, King's Lynn, Laisterdyke, Lancaster, Launceston (2), Leeds (3), Leicester, Love West (3), Loughborough, Sparrow Hill, Lostwithiel, Louth, Manchester, Market Rasen, Middleton, Lancashire, Mirfield, Mitcham Mold Green, Monkwearmouth, Mossley. Neath, Nelson, Lancashire, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Newcastle-under-Lyne (2), Newquay, Nantwich, Castle Street, Oldham (3), Ossett, Dale Street, Oswaldtwistle, Pear Tree Green, Pendleton (2). Penzance, Peterborough, Polperro, Poynton, Pudsey, Porthleven, Radstock and District, Ramsbottom, Patmos, Redditch, Roadwater, West Somerset, Ridsdale, Northumberland, Rochdale and District (2), Ryde, St. Bees, St. Dennis, St. Mary's, Scilly Isles, St. Pinnock, St. Teath, Salisbury, Salterhebble, Sheerness, Sheffield (5), Sheringham (2) Shiney Row, Shirley, Sittingbourne Southampton, South Shields, Southwick-on-Wear, Stanhill, Stanningley, Stonebroom, Sunderland (3), Sutton Bridge Skewen, Taunton, Tavistock (2), Trecan, gate, Trewalder, Tontine, Upham-Ventnor, Wakefield, West End, West Woodburn, Weston-super-Mare (2) Whitegate, Whiteheath, Whitford Whittington Moor, Whittlesea, Wigan (3), Woolton, Isle of Wight, Bristol, Huddersfield, Walham Grove; the following Lodges of the Independent Order of Good Templars: Mount Pleasant, Birmingham, Britain's Pride, Birmingham, Hope of Carlisle, Carlisle, Temple, London, Northumbrian Pioneer, North Shields, Excelsior, New Barnet, Rescue, Workington, Cumberland, Livingstone, Wolverhampton, Alexandra Star, Wood Green, Shamrock, Thistle and Rose, New Herrington, Rising Sun Sunderland, True and Steadfast, Castletown, Florida, Chester-le-Street, The Heather Bell, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Furness, Barrow-in-Furness, Beacon, Egremont, Cumberland, Three Nots, Frizington, Hope of Dartford, Dartford, John Hudson, Clay Cross, Hope, Seaton. John Bowen, Deptford, The Re-union, Islington, Araham Lincoln, Exeter. Mounts Bay, Penzance, Sunlight, Falmouth, James Teare, Devonport, Peter Spence, Newton, George Thomas, Bristol, Dr. Meacham's Memorial, Manchester, St. Pancras, London, Victoria Park Lodge. Hackney, Star of Hope, Northampton, Earnest Workers, Batley, Dulwich United, Dulwich, Star of Peace South Shields, Montpelier, Southport, Commonwealth, Plaistow, Benefactor of Mankind, Torpoint, Lambeth Perseverance, South Lambeth, Attercliff, Sheffield, George Wilson MacCree, London, Franklin Home Circle, Stoke-on-Trent, St. Hilda, Hartlepool, Alexander, Woodford, Wesley Hall, Liverpool, The Eldon, Manchester, Middlesbrough Rescue, Middlesbrough-on-Tees, Plymouth Girded Loins, Plymouth, Steadfast Union, Leicester, Ashton's Hope, Ashton-under Lyne, Benjamin Whitworth, Fleetwood, Rose of Somerset, Wincanton, Nil Desperandum, Wigan, Corinium and Pitts United, Cirencester, The Happy Home, Barrow-in-Furness, George Cruikshank, Canning Town, Dare to be a Daniel, Gateshead, Sunbeam, Ramsgate, Rose of Salford, Salford, Hope of Glossop, Glossop, Rev. Charles Garrett, Manchester, Stockwell's Hope, Lambeth, The Concord Somerton, Faith and Hope, Stone, Up and Onward, South Hetton, Hope of Summertown, Oxford, Halifax (Halifax), Beeston Guild, Beeston, Keynsham (Keynsham) Enterprise, Nottingham, Oldbury Excelsior, Oldbury, Weston, Bath, Hope of Pomphlett, Pomphlett, Edward Moore, Wallsend-on-Tyne, Burnley Rescue, Burnley, Pride of South Moor, South Moor, Hope of Colne, Colne, Hugh Bourne, Bath, Good Intent, Openshaw, Pride of Pangbourne (Pangbourne), George Bird, South Shields, St. George's, North Ormesby, William Boulton, Burslem, Bernard Gilpin, Houghton-le-Spring, St. George's, Liverpool, Star of Ilkeston, Ilkeston, The Vectis, Shanklin, Wansbeck, Morpeth Tower, Birkenhead, Walthamstow, Walthamstow, Welcome, Chippenham, Margate Perseverance, Margate, Goodwin Light, Deal, John Cottier, Liscard, Cheshire, Aim at Right, Hyde, Bethesda, Bristol, Fountain of Hope, Sandown, I.W. Hope of Queenboro', Queenboro', Ashley Vale, Bristol, Safeguard of Folkestone, Folkestone, Safeguard of Andover, Andover, Pride of Oldham, Oldham, Pride of Norton, Norton-on-Tees, Jubilee Star of the East, Sunderland, Stand like the Brave, Craghead, Wigston, St. Wolstens, Wigston, St. Helens Pioneer, St. Helens, Freedom of London, Bethnal Green, Advance, Ramsgate, Bridport Crusader, Bridport, Cobden, Stratford, Robertsbridge, Robertsbridge, Benjamin Parson's Ebley, Unity and Advance, Truro, Dawn of Hope, Hebburn New Town, Waterloo, Sheffield, Work of Love, Birmingham, Rising Star, Bedlington, Stratford Excelsior, Stratford, Right over Wrong, Petersfield, John Williams, Leicester, Harbour of Safety, Dipton, New Hope, Huddersfield, Pant of Renown, Loftus, Stillington Progressive, Stillington, Hope of Heeley, Sheffield, Sir Francis Chantrey, Sheffield, Temperance Mission, Warrington, Liverpool Zion, Liverpool, Samaritan, Cheltenham, Rose of Eden, Shildon, Hope of Dunston, Dunston-on-Tyne, The Herschel, Slough, Happy Family, Preston, No Surrender, Nottingham, Guiding Star, Bootle, Mizpah, Tooting, Northern Light, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Golden Rule, Doncaster, Home Mission, Huddersfield, Eastbourne, Eastbourne, Earnest and True, Weston-super-Mare, Edward Saunders, Lavington, Cromwell, Huntingdon, Reformer, Seaton Delavel, Progress, Yatton, Star of Hope, Timsbury, Cestrian, Chester, Excelsior, Nottingham, Catherine Couzens, King's Lynn, Par Star of Hope, Par, Hope of Earlstown, Earlestown, Truro Guiding Star, Truro, Hope of Wick, Littlehampton, Sparkling Water, Gurney Valley, Beacon Light, Cleethorpes, Spa, Melksham, Blossom of Friendship, Leeds, General Gordon, Bedlington, Lady Boyne, Langley Moor, The Central, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Hope of Hayden, Haydon Bridge, Help and Refuge, Redruth, Templar's Pride, Liverpool, Everton Excelsior, Liverpool, Brandon Mount Beulah, Brandon Colliery, Star of Worcester, Worcester, Watford, Watford, Chelmsford, Chelmsford, Barnes, Barnes, Dawn of Liberty, Southampton, Come and Welcome, Yeovil, The Refuge, Wallingford, Whitfield Excelsior, Ashford, Kent, Widnes Consolation, Widnes, Hope of Murton, Murton, Harbour Light, Rotherhithe, Kirkbride, Delight, Kirkbride, Jubilee, Lynton, Emblem of Purity, Sunnyside, near Tow Law, Sidcup Advance, Sidcup, Charity, Eastbourne, Star of the Glen, Hedley Hill, Pull Together, Shipley, New Seaham Jubilee, New Seaham, Auckland Reformer, Bishop Auckland, Hope of Tiverton, Tiverton, London Tabernacle, Chelsea, Hope of Howden, Howden-le-Wear, Alpha, Leigh, Rose of England, Tywardreath, Light of the Valley, Bishop Auckland, Rose of Sunnybrow, Bishop Auckland, Red Hill Safeguard, Red Hill, George Thorneleo, Walworth, Myrtle Grove, Eastwood, Unity Camp, Folkestone, Onward and Upward, Dartmouth, Brunswick, West Hartlepool, Bolden Jubilee, Bolden Colliery, St. James, Sheffield, Harbour of Refuge, Haswell, Rose of Love, Coundon, Riverside, Liverpool, Tiverton, Bath, Royal Sussex Brighton, Neal Dow, Ardingley, Excelsior, Newport Pagnell, Star of Hope, West Hartlepool, Offspring of Hope, Bootle, Perseverance, Exeter, Peace and Unity, Workington, Eltringham Prospect, Prudhoe, Thomas Munday, Blackfriars, The Corsham, Gleaner, Corsham, Gordon, Lympstone, Hope of Ruspidge, Cinderford, Henshaw, Oldham, John Harrison, Birkenhead, Hope of St. Bartholomew, Pendleton, Bolton Claremont, Bolton, Perseverance, Rotherham, Kensington Royal Standard, Liverpool, Lacock Perseverance, Lacock, Newbury Endeavour, Newbury, Sir Horace Neol, Hinckley, Friends of Godalming, Godalming, Castle, Launceston, Cranbrook, Ilford, Birmingham Cambrian, Aston Manor, Hugh Bourne, Kingston, United Effort Hull, Friend, Stockton-on-Tees, Perseverance, Norwich, Victory of Chopwell, Chopwell, Pride of Ipswich, Ipswich, Ernest Jones, Consett, Bond of Unity, Manor Park, Hope of Mount Pleasant, Crook, Failsworth Welcome Stranger, Failsworth, California Rescue, Derby, Ark of Safety, Carlingcott, The Home Again, Burslem, Jubilee Pansy, Darlaston, Elizabeth Box Memorial, Dursley, Hope of Ealing, Ealing, Star of Gorleston, Gorleston, Crusaders of Chertsey, Chertsey, Avon Valley, Ringwood, James Towers', Birkenhead, Wild Rose, Evenwood, Edward Pease, Darlington, Direct Veto, Birmingham, Invincible Crusader, Maidstone, Nil Desperandum, Birmingham, Neal Dow, Honiton, Sobriety, Birtley, S.O., Amicable, Chesterfield, Never Die, Peasedown St. John, Brampton Lifeboat, Chesterfield, Southsea Royal Albert, Portsmouth, Hurstmoncieux Castle, Hurstmoncieux, Southtown, Great Yarmouth, Stantonbury Pioneer, Wolverton, The Isle of Thanet, Margate, Charltons Excelsior, Stangbrow, Trinity Pioneer, London, Queen's Own, London, Star of the East, Broadstairs, Olive Branch Cockfield, The Heart and Hand, Byers Green, Armoury Lodge, Southall, Walmer Castle, Lower Walmer, William Tweedie, Camberwell, Lifeboat, Irthlingborough, Sileby United, Sileby, Morecambe, Morecambe, The Turn of the Tide, Walworth, Hope of Brixton, Clapham, Hope of Haverton Hill, Haverton Hill, Go Forward, Wandsworth, The Mizpah, Plumstead, Humanity, Willesden, Bradford Onward, Bradford, Yorkshire, Hope of Kennington, Ashford, Kent, Work and Win, Blyth Bridge, Roselands Jubilee, Eastbourne, Sunbeam, Wakefield, Happy Home, South Wigston, One More Effort, Wandsworth, David Melvin, Oxford, Valley of Peace, Pentonville, Battersea Welcome, Battersea, Park Vale, Leicester, Harmonius, Hull, Parton Jubilee, Parton, Heart of Oak, North Shields, Bowes Park, Wood Green, Jubilee Emancipation, Witton Gilbert, Rose of Newbottle, Newbottle, Answorth Jubilee, Answorth, W. E. Gladstone, Wallsend-on-Tyne, Mantle Memorial, Leicester, Jacks Palace, Limehouse, Workers-on-the-Hill, Tunstall, Topsham, Topsham, Hope of Paignton, Paignton, Hope, Crawley, Darnall Reformers, Sheffield, Rayleigh Endeavour, Rayleigh, East Ham Samaritan, East Ham, Dulwich Victorious, East Dulwich, Standard, Gorton, Willis Loyal and True, Greencroft, The Harmony, Hackney, Star of Cravan, Barnoldswick, Star of St. Mary, Southampton, Burnham, Burnham, Teesdale Social, Middleton-in-Teesdale, Star of Hove, Hove, Hope of Wadsley Bridge, Wadsley Bridge, Pride of Stowmarket, Stowmarket, Edgbaston United, Birmingham, Southwick Seamen's Friend, Southwick, Parkeston Alexandra, Parkeston, Port, Coventry, Seven Kings, Seven Kings, Rose of Derby, Derby, Home of Peace, Barrow-in-Furness, Goldsithney, Goldsithney, Hope of Disley, Disley, Frederick Meyer, Lambeth, Staithes Rescue, Staithes, Hope of Henfield, Henfield, Essex Onward, Leyton, Lord Nelson's Memorial, Ashton-under-Lyne, Hope of Staindrop, Staindrop, Hope of Laindon, Laindon, The Whitgift, Croydon, Manningham Progressive, Bradford, Hope of Hasland, Hasland, James Mackenie, South Shields, The Coleridge, Ottery St. Mary, Swan Templars, Liverpool, Pride of Chilton, Chilton, Whitgift Effort, Southbourne, St. James of Watford, Watford, Mary Gibbs, Custom House, Sandiacre and Stapleford United, Sandiacre, Monument, Wellington, Somerset, Vale of Tanfield Lea, Tanfield, Hope of Vange, Vange, Sherwood Forest, Nottingham, Hornsey St. George, Hornsey, J. S. Vorley, Coalville, Ephphatha, Sheffield, Hope of Ropley, Ropley, Nil Desperandum, Rochford, Kislingbury, Kislingbury, Anchor, Grimsby, East Ham Nazareth, East Ham, Hope of Grays, Grays, Hope of Greenhill, Harrow, Crediton, Crediton, Bedfont Unity, Bedfont, Hope of Ardwick, Manchester, Grassmoor Forward, Grassmoor, Carlton, Birmingham, Adderbury Ark of Love, Adderbury, Pride of Gillingham, Gillingham, Dorset, The Crystal, Workington, Solway Spring, Flimby, Hope of Crook, Crook, Ever Welcome, Stretford, Star of Belgravia, London, Surbiton, Surbiton, The Tramway Beacon Light, Broadstairs, Edridge, Croydon, Wardley Rover, Wardley Colliery, The United, Reigate, Moorland Pioneer, Leek, Dover Emmanuel, Dover, Kensington Perseverance, Kensington, Hope of Potters Green, Coventry, Wimbledon, Wimbledon, Ellesmere Pioneer, Farnworth, Hope of Erdington, Birmingham, Reddish, Stockport, Mildred Forth, Leicester, North Walbottle Reform, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Pride of the Isle, Barrow-in-Furness, M. A. Pearce, Deptford, Peckham, Peckham Rye, Excelsior, Birmingham, Crystal Palace, Penge, St. Andrew's, Hebburn, Golden Stream, Bermondsey, Sir Wilfred Lawson, Cockermouth, Southsea, Portsmouth, William Palmer, Tottenham, Flower of the West, Whitehaven, James McCurry, Chelsea, Press Forward, Maidenhead, Felling Safeguard, Felling-on-Tyne, United Jubilee, Leeds, Temperance Hall, Walsall, Caroline Lawson, Aspatria, City of London, Clerkenwell, Dingle, Liverpool, Star of the Cotswold, Chedworth, Manchester Pioneer, Manchester, Hope of Chorley, Chorley, Grand Alliance, Manchester, Jesse Sessions, Gloucester, Lincolnshire's First, Lincoln, City of Oxford, Oxford, Onward, Stockton-on-Tees, Samuel Albert, Newton Abbot, Torbay, Brixham, Black Diamond, Dearham, Enterprise, Wigton, Hope of Weston, Bath, Spellow Templars, Liverpool, Winton, Marylebone, Birkenhead Hope, Birkenhead, Toxteth, Liverpool, Pure Stream, Broughton, Open Door, Belmont, William Woodall, Hull, Undercliff, Ventnor, Flow of Severn, Newnham, Wilberforce, Middlesbrough, Harmony, Huddersfield, Richmond Hill, Richmond, Good Hope, Norwich, No Surrender, Shildon, Star of Solway, Maryport, Hope of Mitcham, Mitcham, Champion, Lee, Pride of Birkenhead, Birkenhead, Seacomb Bethel, Seacombe, Benjamin Hill, Bermondsey, James Thorne, Bristol, Torquay Excelsior, Torquay, Star of Hope, Poole, Charles Garrett, Burslem, Reading, Reading, Henry Ansell, London, Ephraim Ellis, Derby, Surrey Commercial, Rotherhithe, Swindon United, Swindon, London Olive Branch, London, Hand of Friendship, Hoxton, Templars Alliance, Portsmouth, Jabez Burns, London, Lindum, Lincoln, Wiveliscombe, Wiveliscombe, Rock of Safety, Leicester, Hope of Bearwood, Smethwick, Forward, Birmingham, County Palatine, Lancaster, Northampton Pioneer, Northampton, Highworth Perseverance, Highworth, Abingdon, Abingdon, Rialto, Sheffield, Frederick Shaw, Northampton, Star of Brotton, Brotton, Ralph Walton, North Shields, First Suffolk St. Edmunds, Bury St. Edmunds, Hebburn's Hope, Hebburn, Hope of Rushden, Rushden, Fair City, Gloucester, Hope of Landport, Portsmouth, Silver Stream, Lewisham, St. Leonards, Hastings, Seghill Blake, Seghill, St. Oswald, Oswestry, Whitefield, London Henry Kirke White, Nottingham, Rother, Rotherham, Ark of Love, Plymouth, Hope of Banbury, Banbury, Croydon Pioneer, Croydon, Aldershot, Aldershot, Ellesmere, Sheffield, Nephalia, Southport, Hope of Droylesden, Borough Market, Southwark, Rochdale Pioneer, Rochdale, Gleam of Sunshine, Birkenhead, Plumstead Victory, Plumstead, Hope to Prosper, Clenchwarton, Guildford, Guildford, Tivolian, Cheltenham, Liskeard, Liskeard, Forest Gate Perseverance, Forest Gate, Lewes Castle, Lewes, Hope of Nunhead, Nunhead, True and Ever Faithful, High Brooms, Central, Stockport, Dawn of Peace, Guisbrough, Hope of Whitchurch, Whitchurch, Charnwood, Loughborough, Admiral Blake, Bridgwater, Sir Walter C. Trevelyan, Blyth, Bracknell, Bracknell, Dawn of Hope, Southampton, Hope of South Norwood, South Norwood, Olive Branch, North Shields, Rose of Brentford, Brentford, Star of Peace, Hinckley, Nelson Welcome, Nelson, Tiverton, Tiverton, Hope of Newchurch, Newchurch, Bilston, Rainbow, Bilston, Peaceful Progress, Birkdale, George Clark, Yeovil, Wolcot Good Samaritan, Bath, Cheltonian, Cheltenham, Star of Faith, Barnstaple, James Rewcastle, Hartlepool, Morning Star, Rawtenstall, Jubilee, Scarborough, Star of Hope, Wroxall, Pride of Thornaby, Thornaby, Plymouth, Plymouth, Beacon of Hope, Tow Law, Ark of Safety, Coalville, Nil Desperandum, Wales, Hope of Louth, Louth, Light on the Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne, George Dodds, Tudhoe Colliery, England's Pride, Brierley Hill, Marlborough, Chelsea, Hope of Teesdale, Barnard Castle, Hope of Hindley, Hindley, Wesley, Exeter, Pride of Fishponds, Fishponds, Hope of Annfield Plain, Annfield Plain, Colne Valley, Huddersfield, Enterprise, Oldham, Star of Blackburn, Blackburn, Robert Raikes, Gloucester, Hope of Longtown, Longtown, Hope of Willington, Willington, Bona Fide, Porthleven, True Friendship, North Shields, Faithful Friend, Butterknowle, Three Town Excelsior, Stonehouse, Good of the Order, Catford, Hope of Burton, Burton-on-Trent, Hamilton Square, Birkenhead, Pride of Grimesthorpe, Sheffield, Hope of West Stanley, West Stanley, Rose of Radford, Nottingham, Dr. John Fothergill, Darlington, Rose of Accrington, Accrington, Pride of East Ham, East Ham, Active, Newark, Star of Bethlehem, Hull, Pride of the West, Tow Law, Granite Rock, Mount Sorrell, Hope of New Trimdon, Trimdon, Nuneaton's Hope, Nuneaton, Hambledon Hill, Market Rasen, Julius Benn, Bow, Hope of Leytonstone, Leytonstone, Floreat Hova, Hove, Hope of Nettleworth and Plawsworth, Nettlesworth, Pride of Rusholme, Manchester, Safeguard, Wymondham, John Bright, Aylesford, Bournville, Bournville, Ray of Hope, Southampton, William Woods Memorial, Ashton-under-Lyne, Alert, Bermondsey, Triumph, Accrington, Star of Teddington, Teddington, Emanuel, Leicester, Alpaca, Bradford, Hope of Marley Hill, Sunniside, Anchor, Merton, Retford Excelsior, Retford, General Gordon, Bedlington Station, Crescent, Northwich, Perseverance, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Hope of Tyldesley, Tyldesley, John Ingram, Stamford, Edmondsley Safeguard, Edmondsley, Carshalton Rainbow, Carshalton, Parkstone, Poole, Sturdy Colyton, Norman, Wellingborough, Advance Guard, Brighton, Star of Hope, Burslem, Boscombe, Bournemouth, Crown of Surrey, Norwood, Pride of Exeter, Exeter, Friendly Help, Arnold, Memorial, Hull, Endeavour, Nantwich, Bonehill Branch, Warrington, Bethel, Great Yarmouth, Beacon Light, Stratford, Stand like the Brave, Tynemouth, Island Centre, Newport, Welcome, Lowestoft, Laurel Mount, Shipley, Josiah Wedgwood, Burslem, Hope of Browney, Browney, Pilsley Jubilee, Pilsley, Jubilee Effort, High Littleton, Sutton Excelsior, Sutton, Tower of Refuge, Manchester, East Anglia, Beccles, Isaac Love, Durham, Star of Hammersmith, Hammersmith, Bradford City, Bradford, Good Shepherd, Hammersmith, Peter the Hermit, Plymouth, Cowes Harbour Light, Cowes Stratford Enterprise, Stratford, Robert Nicholson, Rosehill-on-Tyne, Shepherd's Bush Reform, Hammersmith, City of Newcastle, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Star of St. Denys, Southampton, William Tyndale, Gloucester, Lighthouse, Westyn Rhyn, Shaftesbury Park, Battersea, Diamond Jubilee, Salford, Crystal Water, Hetton-le-Hole, Stephen Percy, Guildford, Deus Vult, Cambridge, Undaunted, Highbridge, Star of Widnes, Widnes, Energy, Gillingham, Chesterton Providence, Cambridge, Maybury Sunbeam, Woking, Lily of the Valley, Quebec, Star of Hope, Harwich, Excelsior, Staines, Fenny Stratford, Fenny Stratford, Hope of Wem, Wem, Oxford Nimshi, Sheffield, Hope of Worksop, Worksop, Gainsborough, Sudbury, Thomas Guthrie, Sheerness, Deal with them Kindly, Fenton, George Peabody, Pelton Fell, Star of Hope, Normanton, Rose of Wheatley Hill, Wheatley Hill, Farnham, Farnham, Sunbury Ark of Safety, Sunbury, Devon Excelsior, North Tawton, Triumph of Hope, Spennymoor, Hope of Rugby, Rugby, Unity and Liberty, West Ham, Sure Refuge, New Malden, Southampton, Southampton, Hope of Silksworth, New Silksworth, Ocean Grimsby, Oldham, Perseverance, Oldham, Stamford, Southwark, No Surrender, Sheffield, Totterdown Excelsior, Bristol, St. Ivo, St. Ives, Grosvenor, London, Charles Walsham, Hull, Workman's Own, Worthing, St. John's Hill, Clapham, Hope of All Souls, Liverpool, Advance Battersea, Grovelands, Reading, King's Cross Excelsior, London, Sir Thomas White, Coventry, Ryhope Ebenezer, Ryhope, Fortress, Peterborough, Hope of Billy Row, Crook, Loyal Favourite, Islington, Sumus, Middlesborough, Trinity Star, Sittingbourne, St. Aubyn, Devonport, Hopeful, Uxbridge, St. Paul's Excelsior, Wolverhampton, Hill of Zion, Swanscombe, Jubilee Lighthouse, Brierley Hill, Pride of Hythe, Hythe, Hand of Friendship, Southampton, Beacon of the Border, Carlisle, Nil Desperandum Leeds, Rose of Blisworth, Blisworth, Hope of Lingdale, Lingdale, Equal Rights, Felling, Friend of All, Lemington-on-Tyne, Corner Stone, Poplar, Excelsior, Northampton, Vale of Hope, Stourbridge, James Eaton, Camberwell, Holloway United, Holloway, Always Aspiring, West Hartlepool, Rescue of Throckley, Throckley, Prince of Peace, Leicester, Frederick Cavendish, Chiswick, Stability Thurlby, Hope to Win, Southorpe, Stand Firm, Burnopfield, Pride of Essex, West Ham, Manors, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Pride of the Lea, Luton, Never Venture Never Win, Haverhill, Long Reign, New

Brancepeth, Ivy, Acton, Weston Star, Maidstone, King of the Forest, Drybrook, Hope of Streatham, Streatham, Cheddington Progress, Cheddington, Helping Hand, Gosforth, Fetter Lane, Leytonstone, Elizabeth Fry, East Ham, Victory Win, Fulham, Northgate, Great Yarmouth, Valediction, Iver, Never Too Late, Tunbridge Wells, Pride of Tranmere, Birkenhead, Pleasant Here, Ashton-under-Lyne, Sunshine and Gladness, Catchgate, Henry Browne, London, Burnley Lily White, Burnley, Bletchley, Bletchley, Westbourne, Bournemouth, Tustin, Horley, Albany, Finsbury, Mintern Pioneer, Hoxton, Walton Olive Branch, Walton, Shepherd's Rescue, Leeds, Providence, Sheffield, Pendlebury Blue Ribbon, Pendlebury, Pride of Normanton, Derby, Christian Workers, Highbury, Barrowford, Barrowford, Gleam of Hope, Middlesbrough, Edmonton, Edmonton, Alexandra, Blackpool, Hope for Success, Keighley, Thomas Whittaker, Weston-super-Mare, Hope of Coulsdon, Croydon, Richard Cadbury, Birmingham, Fellowship, Croydon, St. Margaret's Excelsior, Isleworth, Bishop Beveridge, Barrow-on-Soar, Bromsgrove, Invincible, Bromsgrove, Tongham Aggressive, Tongham, Sileby Star of Hope, Sileby, Hope of Claydon, Steeple Claydon, Warspite, Silvertown, Leyton Coronation, Leyton, Ashford, Middlesex, Ashford, Sussex Rescue, Portslade-by-the-Sea, George Muller, Bristol, Westcliffe-on-Sea, Southend-on-Sea, Tring Excelsior, Tring, Borough, Torquay, Smallbridge Crusaders, Rochdale, Congress, Sevenoaks, Progress, Farnworth, J. B. Finch, Peckham, Excelsior, Carlisle, Pilots Safeguard, South Shields, Camberley and Yorktown United, Camberley, Hope of St. Andrew's, Bishop Auckland, Warwick Victory, Warwick, Eldon Rescue, Eldon, Hope of Mapperley, Mapperley, Shepherd's Bush Advance, Hammersmith, Bootle Excelsior, Bootle, Bow Brickhill, Bow Brickhill, Hope of Southchurch, Southend-on-Sea, Faversham Out and Out, Faversham, Victory, London, Burnley Good Samaritan, Burnley, Good Hope of King's Norton, King's Norton, Mona of Douglas, Douglas, Swallowfield, Swallowfield, Hinckley's Pride, Hinckley, Lily of the Green, Bradford, Frederick James, Twickenham, Good Hope of Isleworth, Isleworth, Talbot Rescue, South Shields, Pride of Bembridge, Bembridge, Silverton Primrose, Silvertown, Perseverance, Oswestry, Beckenham, Beckenham, Lily of Ludworth, Ludworth, Caldecote Excelsior, Caldecote, Bournemouth Safeguard, Bournemouth, Fulham Perseverance, Fulham, Ridgemont, Ridgmont, Beacon Light, Gloucester, Ivy Branch, Gravesend, Hope of Conisborough, Conisborough, Pride of Long Eaton, Long Eaton, Mirfield, Mirfield, Victoria, Grimsby, Aintree Pioneer, Liverpool, Neston Endeavour, Neston, Beehive, Birmingham, Lily of the Valley, Haslingden, Hand in Hand, Stafford, Hope of Redfields, Bristol, Dove Valley, Ashbourne, Manor Park, East Ham, Mortlake Pioneer, Mortlake, Star of Oswaldtwistle, Oswaldtwistle, Peaceful Home, Dronfield, Egremont Excelsior, Egremont, De Winton Memorial, Easington Lane, Whitley Bay, Whitley Bay, Beacon Light of New Boultham, New Boultham, Cambois Progress, Cambois, Branksome Forward, Poole, Ashfield, Liverpool, Fraternity, Kingswood, Railway Mission, Bedford, Egerton Mission, New Brighton, Ilford Welcome, Ilford, Pride of Beacontree Heath, Romford, Wolverton St. George's, Wolverton, Essex Exempler, Plaistow, Hope of Ferryhill Station, Ferryhill, Herne Bay, Herne Bay, Staveley Onward, Staveley, Hope of St. Anne's, St. Anne's-on-Sea, Woking Rescue, Woking, Shiney Row, Shiney Row, Upper Parkstone Sunbeam, Parkstone, Sunbeam of Worrall Hill, Gloucester, Sir Wilfrid, Leytonstone, Star of Acomb, Acomb, Pride of Washington Washington, Good Intent of Cleator Moor, Cleator Moor, Waterfoot Prosperity, Waterfoot, West Kirby Endeavour, West Kirby, Loyal Hope, York, Blackpool Lifeboat, Blackpool, Central, Leicester, Hugh Bourne Memorial, Tunstall, Dawn of Day, Ash Vale, Sir W. Lawson Memorial, Wandsworth, Hope of Kelly Bray, Callington, Hope of Holmes, Rotherham, Watson Street Mission, Plaistow, John Stobbs, Cullercoats, Helping Hand, Droitwich, Hope of Willenhall, Willenhall, Work and Win, Yardley Hastings, United Conquerors, Plaistow, Star of St. George, Devonport, The Hartlepool's Friend, West Hartlepool, Earlsfield, Wandsworth, Grenfell Memorial, King's Norton, Nutfield City of Refuge, Nutfield, Hope of Southwark,

Southwark, Raynes Park, Merton, Woodside Progress, Croydon, Heart of Britain, Daventry, Rehoboth, Percy Main, Good Courage, Bitterne, Excelsior, Carterton, Heavitree, Heavitree, Blackpool Welcome Blackpool, Young People's Refuge, Lumley, Good Treasure, Southwark, Meadow United, Nottingham, Pride of Apperley, Bradford, Mayflower, West Ham, Life Line, Torquay, Tranmere St. Paul's, Birkenhead, Pride of Station Gates, Prudhoe, Star of Victory, Scunthorpe, Mansfield Reform, Mansfield, Hope of Everton, Liverpool, Washington, Little Brington, Henry Bloomer, Holloway, Pride of South Shields, South Shields; Of the following District Lodges of the Good Templars: Berkshire, Devonshire, Mid, Devonshire, South-West, Essex, Kent, East, Kent, West, Lancashire, South-East, Norfolk, Salop, Somerset, East, Surrey, East and Mid, Worcestershire, Yorkshire, Central, Yorkshire, East Executive Committees of Cumberland, North and Mid District Lodge, Durham, South District Lodge, Middlesex District Lodge, Yorkshire, South-West District Lodge; Quarterly Session of the Devonshire, South-West, Juvenile Council; United Sunday Service of Lodges in Devonshire, South-West; United Meeting of Good Templars of Northamptonshire at Rushden; Temperance Meeting in connection with the Good Templars at Levenshulme; Quarterly Meeting of the Leicestershire District Juvenile Council; Lancashire, South-East District Juvenile Council; Good Templars of Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes in United Session at Grimsby; Romford Group (Constituency) Convention at East Ham; Weekly Meeting of Good Templars at Darlington, Sub-District of Good Templars comprising Reigate, Redhill, Horley, and Nutfield; Surrey East and Mid District Political Council Meeting (7th November); Surrey East and Mid District Political Council Meeting (11th November); Surrey East and Mid District Good of Order Committee; Sheffield Convention of Lodges; Public Meeting in connection with Surrey East and Mid Juvenile Council; Public Meeting of Citizens at Dover; Public Meeting of Inhabitants of Torquay and neighbourhood; Public Meeting of Inhabitants of Half-Way House, Minster; Petition of Congregational Church, Staithes, Yorkshire; Resolution from Primitive Methodist Church, Bedlington Station; Resolution from Primitive Methodist Church, Browney Colliery; Public Meeting of Citizens held at Worthing; Railway Mission Christian Endeavour Society, Bedford; Public Meeting held at Leicester; Public Temperance Meeting held in Leeds; Public Temperance Meeting held at Croydon; Public Temperance Meeting held at Salford; Public Meeting of Inhabitants, Eastbourne; Public Meeting of Inhabitants, Sutton, Surrey; Justices of the Peace, Poor Law Guardians, University Professors, etc., Members of the Medical Profession; Head Masters, Mistresses, and Teachers in the Elementary and Secondary Schools (2); Birmingham Nurses (3); Independent Labour Party; Religious Institutions of Various Denominations (8); General Petitions from the Inhabitants of Birmingham and District (19); Societies and Guilds at Colne (2); Downham and District, Leeds, Birkenshaw, South Shields, Tyne Dock, Shoreham, Swindon, Mansfield, Downham Market, High Bentham, 25 Lodges of the International Order of Good Templars, Bands of Hope at Barton St. David, Vobster, Brampton, South Shields, Bacup, Sheffield, Yorkshire, Bromley Common, Carshalton, Bolton, Colne (3), Tonbridge, Desborough, Bude (2), Winton, Waddock, Penryn, Mid-Somerset, Whaddon, Paulton and District, Littleworth, Gospel Temperance Union and United Temperance Action Council, South Shields; League of Sympathy and Band of Hope, Derby; Temperance Societies at Melbourne, Matlock, Rothwell; Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants and Peaceful Dove Friendly Society, Keighley; Temperance Council, Leeds; Total Abstinence Society, Downham Market; Temperance Workers Somerton; Temperance Societies, Weston-super-Mare; United Temperance Council, Swindon; Baptist Temperance Society, Ilfracombe; United Temperance Council, Ilfracombe; Great Western Railway Temperance Union, Swindon; Help Myself Society and Temperance Society, Reading; Band of Hope, Barnstaple; Temperance Society Bedminster; Total Abstinence Societies at Churchill, Ilchester, Shebbear; Temperance Societies at Bourton and Yeats, Land Key, Portesham, Winscombe, Clawton, Calne, Mere, Finsbury; Anti-Smoking League, Bristol; Presbyterian Guild, Willington; North Eastern Railway Temperance Union, Hartlepool; Sons of Temperance Friendly Society, Hull; Wesley Church, Hartlepool; Christian Temperance Association, Sheffield; Temperance Societies at Rotherham, Morley; Temperance Workers, Liverpool; Temperance Society, Midsomer Norton; Band of Hope, Nelson; Public Meetings at Neston, Liverpool, Colnbrook, Bicester, Preston, Croston, Lancashire, Burnley, Freckleton, Ashton-on-Ribble, Bradford, Golcar; Employees of 9 Firms at Plymouth; United Methodist Churches at Bedlington, Cambois, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Peckham; Primitive Methodists of Rudgeway, Bedlington; Wesleyan Churches at Greenhill, Polbathic; United Methodists, Liskeard; Congregational Churches at Liskeard, Rainham, Hawkesbury, Buckley; Baptist Church, Wandsworth; Free Christian Church Dover, Unitarian Church, Belper; Free Church Council, Woolwich; Public Meetings at Westmarsh, Tollington Park, Inhabitants of Tollington Park, Westhay and Meath, Wincanton, East Leeds; Public Meetings at Wandsworth (2) Sutton-on-Trent, Walworth and Newington, Royal Victoria Hall, Waterloo Road (3), Broadstairs, Stourmouth; British Women's Temperance Associations at Scotswood-on-Tyne, Gillingham, Putney, Heaton, Gloucestershire; Adult School Union, Bradford; Baptist Church, Walworth; Baptist Christian Endeavour, Earlsfield; Wesleyan Sunday School, Bromley, Church of England Temperance Society, Strood; Band of Hope, Folkestone; Temperance Associations at Eastington, Hunslet; Total Abstinence Society, Ash, Middlesex Temperance Federation, Unitarian Temperance Society, East Hill, Wandsworth; Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Society, Camberwell; Total Abstinence Society, Highgate; Temperance Union, Wandsworth; Temperance Societies, Huddersfield, Stonehouse; Adult School, Wakefield; National Citizens' Convention, St. James's Hall; 250 Tents of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Public Meetings at Newport, Kendal, Disley, Reading, Ossett, Great Horton, Allerton, Wakefield, Mirfield, Purston Pontefract, Outwood, Bradford, Guisley, Cottingley, Wrenthorpe, Shipley, Otley, Driglington, Earley, Little Horton, Barnoldswick, Littletown, Bradford, Wigan, Wyke, Frome, Wilton, Gospel Oak, Chertsey, South Norwood, Northampton, Clifton and Bristol, Bath; Baptist Churches at Bristol, Upper Tooting, Southfields; Baptist Mission at Southfields; Baptist Churches at Downend, Grays, Rotherham; Congregational Churches at Ockendon, Withenedge, Sandford, Oldham, Bristol (4), Clifton; United Methodist Churches at Bristol (9), Claverham, Sheffield; Independent Methodists Churches at Ince, Ashton; Primitive Methodists at Bristol (3), Sheffield, Walton, Liverpool, Two Missions at Bristol; Friends Meeting, Bristol; Free Church Council, Hants Federation Y.M.C.A., Mass Meeting Free Churches, Southampton; Chapels at Pilkington, Kendal; Churches, Chapels, and Missions at Hollinwood, Sheffield, Glossop, Beaminster, Bristol, Fishponds, Bristol (2), Methodist Churches at Barnsley, Sheffield, Garsgill, Port Clarence, Middlesborough, Stainton in Cleveland, Bristol (4), Brimington, Stockbridge, Brighton (2), Stainforth; Mission, Nottingham; Congregational Church, Pwhelli; Church of Our Father, Rotherham; Wesleyan Mission, Middlesborough; Sergeant Street Chapel, Bedminster, Bristol, Methodist Missions at Bristol (2); Middlesborough Presbyterian Church and Society of Friends, Middlesborough, Women's Pleasant Hour, Shortlands; Sunday Schools at Claverham, Kennington, S.E., Shortlands; Schools at Sheffield (2), Hull, Stockton on Tees; Church of England Temperance Society at Ivegill, Reading; Inhabitants of Reading, Avonmouth, Shortlands; Congregational Church, Bristol; Press Forward Temperance Society, Reading; Public Meeting, Raunthorpe; Young Women's Christian Association, Bromley; Carbrook Reform Ladies Class, Sheffield; Railway Mission Christian Association, Sheffield; Nottingham Temperance Federation, Nottingham; Heavy Woollen Union Temperance Association, Dewsbury; Wesleyan Sunday School, Port Clarence; Wesley Guilds at Yeovil, Hoylake, Birkenhead, Middlesborough; Ladies Missionary Auxillary, Claverham; Women's Total Abstinence Unions at

Thornton Heath, Claverham, British Women's Temperance Association, Leeds, Liberal Association, Street, Temperance and Total Abstinence Societies at Halifax, Winchmore Hill, Middlesboro', Nottingham; Bands of Hope at Crownhill, Yeovil, New Brighton, Liskeard, Bristol, Bromley, Cheriton Fitzpaine; Christian Endeavour Societies at Middlesboro', Sherwell, Plymouth (8), St. Budeaux, Devonport (7), Union Street, Plymouth, Embankment Road, Plymouth, Plympton, Maidstone, Bromley, Hull (2), Middlesborough; Men's Adult School, Staple Hill, Bristol; Men's Meeting, Longton, Bristol; Wesleyan Mothers Meeting, Middlesborough; Adult Schools at Dewsbury, Middlesborough (2); Mothers Meeting and Adult Bible Class, Middlesborough; Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Societies: West Kirby, Bristol (2); Young Men's Prayer Meeting, Pontadawe; Carbrook Reform Men's Class, Sheffield; Men's Meeting, Wandsworth, S.W.; Daniell's Society Classes at Middlesborough, New Brighton (3); Brotherhoods at Hoylake, Bromley, Bristol, Plymouth, Foots Cray, Balham; Whitehall Men's Bible Class, Bristol; Shaftesbury Crusade, Bristol; 92 tents of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Primitive Methodist Churches at West Pelton, South Moor, Annfield Plain (2), East Stanley, Tanfield Lea, Greencroft, Burnhope, Oxhill, West Stanley, Castletown, Lowick, Wooler, Milfield, Belford, Donaldson's Lodge, Ouston, Birtley, Fatfield, Pelton, Portobello, Kneblesworth, Waldridge Fell, Pilton Fell, Chester-le-Street, Pelsall, Grimsby (2), Fosdyke, Barton-on-Humber, Bonley, Goxill, South Fernby, Ulceby, Wootton, East Halton, Thornton, Kennington, Horkston, New Holland, Worlaby, Barrow-on-Humber, Market Rasen, Osgodby, Gainsboro' (2), Morton, Corningham, Gringley-on-the-Hill, Walkingham, Crowley, Keadley, Beltoft, Ealand, Crowle, Liskeard, Cheesewring, Tremar, King's Lynn, Clenchwarton, Massingham, Grimston, Gayton Thorpe, East Walton, Gayton, West Winch, St. Germans, St. Mary, Dalkeith, Blakenall, Lettleworth, Newcastle-on-Tyne (4), St. Antony-on-Tyne, Walker-on-Tyne, West Moor, Wallsend-on-Tyne, Baildon; Church of Christ at Erdington, Birmingham, Earlstown, Newton-le-Willows; Wesleyan Churches, Windmill Hill, Shipley (2), Baildon Green, Rotherham, Masbro', Doncaster, Looe; Methodist New Connexion, Brighouse; United Methodists of Bristol (4), Nailsea, Mount Warleggan, St. Neot's, Bolventor, East Looe, Polperro, Widegates, St. Cleer, Alvaston Mission; Baptist Churches at Bristol (3), Leytonstone, Oxford; Congregational Churches at Looe, Keighley, Shipley, Bridlington, Brighouse; Old Meeting House, Framlingham; Independent Church, Windhill, Shipley; Broadmead Chapel, Bristol; Crossway Central Mission, Old Kent Road; Town Hall, Cottingley, Yorkshire; Popular Service Peoples Hall, Shipley; Robert Hall Memorial Chapel, Leicester; Mission Halls at Liverpool (4); Unitarian Churches at Bedfield, Sale; Free Churches at Ilminster, Halesowen, Weymouth; Society of Friends, Sheffield; Church of England Men's Society, Bournemouth; Adult Schools at Wanstead (2); Young Women's Christian Association, Leytonstone; Men's Own Brotherhood, Bristol; Adult Schools at Shipley, Bridlington (2), Weston-super-Mare; Men's Own Meeting, Saltaire; Men's Pleasant Sunday Afternoon, Enfield; Young Men's Bible Class, Derby; Men's Society, Oxford; Crown Hall, Men's, Liverpool; Men's Own (Baptist), Bristol; Christian Endeavour Rallies at Mexborough, Bridlington; Young People's Society, Bridlington; Wesley Guilds, etc. at Derby, North Cave, Handley; Adult Bible Class at Hosforth; Free Church Federation, Cheriton Fitzpaine; Congregational Church, Baughing; District Band of Hope Union, Keighley; Bands of Hope at Derby (2); Bands of Hope, Temperance Societies at Clifton, Doncaster (4), Alvaston, Bridgwater (2), Leytonstone, Swindon (2), Leicester, Weston, Keighley (2), Derby, Cottingham, Sheffield, Hull, Enderby, Blackburn, Newington Green, Tanfield Lea; Inhabitants of Thatcham, Horsham; Meetings at Hull, South Cave, Hither Green, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Brighouse, Great Coates, Healing; Inhabitants of Dursley; Wesleyan Sunday Schools at Rotherham, Rastrick, Baildon, Keighley (3), Halifax; Independent Order of Rechabites (23); Independent Methodist Church, Warmley; Cramtington Free Church Council; Some Members and

Adherents of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in England; Calvinistic Methodist Churches and Congregations: In Pembroke, Merioneth, Montgomery, Anglesey, and Flint (119); 1,200 Lodges of the International Order of Good Templars; Luton Friends Adult School; Meetings: At Tamworth, Derby, Reddish, Rochdale, Ilkley, Erdington, Peranzabula, Birmingham, Honiton, Bury, Gorton; Three Independent Methodist Churches, Colne District; United Methodist Church, Preston; Committee of Band of Hope Union, Burton-on-Trent; Congregational Churches at Derby and Twyford; Independent Methodist Church, Wigan; Wesley Church, Scittoway; International Order of Good Templars (8); Inhabitants of Liverpool, Ruardean, Bootle, Sandown, New Barnet, Maldon, Temperance Organisations: At Ipswich, Wellington, Bury, Derby, Carroz, West Norwood, Leeds (2), Ossett; National United Temperance Council; Methodist Churches: At Reading, Belper (2), Carnarvon, Newcastle (2), Pendleton, Soughton, Wigan, Oldham, Ashton, Liverpool, South Shields, Monmouth; Wesleyan Churches: At Walworth, Durham, Rechabites (5); Churches, Schools, etc.: At Rhymney, Frodham, Middlesborough, Doncaster, Usk, Middleton, Bury; Persons signing: Church of England Temperance Society (3), Good Templars (8), Temperance Societies and Bands of Hope at Buckland, Sway, Portsmouth (3), Winchester, Christchurch, Churches and Schools at Liss, Southsea, Portsmouth (4), Newcastle-on-Tyne (4), Capel Mawr, Gro, Doncaster, Vale of Dovey, Guernypant, Scarborough, Abertysswg (2), Clawton, Liscard (2), Halifax, Birmingham, East Ardsley; Inhabitants of Eastney; Churches, Societies, Public Meetings, Schools, Guilds, etc.: At Carrog, Ipswich, Barnsley, Glossop, Willington, Cheriton Fitzpaine, Pendleton, Kimberworth, Scarborough (3), Aston, Cockermouth, Middleton, South Shields, York, Chiswick, Tunstall, Sheffield, Ilkeston, Hornsey, Ossett (3), Enfield, Dunfermline, Bishop Stortford, Lye, Ripley, Winsford, Blisworth, Birmingham (3), Oakworth, London, St. Helens, Wood Green, Hassocks (2), Ditchling, Prescot, Bowerbrook, King's Heath, Carnarvon, Norwood, Droylesden, Sirhowy, Soughton, Ynysybwl, Ladywood, Derby, Shipston, St. Clears, Reigate, Thirsk, Fernhead, Mold, Middlesborough, Usk, Handley, Rowdon, Birmingham, Low Bentham, South Manchester, Rechabites (52), Leicester, South Wales, Dumbarton, Ayr, Dingwall, Sheffield, Dundee, Derby, Wellingborough, Mexborough, Bolton, Dunstable, Newcastle-under-Lyme (3), Handford, Baldwins Gate, Macclesfield (2), Poynton, Good Templars (2), St. Helen's (3) Southmoor, Sheffield, Heald, Bristol, Colden, Pontefract, Liverpool, Hull, Grays, Rechabites (4), Whitehaven, Tarporley, Wrexham (3), Richmond, Oldham (2), Ince, King's Lynn, Boston, Wrangle, Leigh, Bury, Fulham, Salisbury, Chard, Birkenhead (2), Birmingham (5), Sons of the Phœnix, Crank, Varteg, Blaenavon, Garndiffaith, Dudley, Walton, Northampton (2), Harlestone Road, Liverpool (2), Yarmouth, Upholland, Appleby, Seacombe, Gooch, Smethwick, Oldbury, New Barnet, Abercynon, New Brumby, Leeds (2), Croft, Irby, Leverton, Thame, Barlestone, Nelson (4), Burnley, Colne (2), Brierfield, Rechabites, Good Templars, Twyford, Cradley, Preston, Eastbourne, Aylesbury (2); read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Petitions against: Of persons signing (7); Pontypridd and Rhondda Valleys Licensed Victuallers Association; Inhabitants of Liverpool, Chester and District (4); Inkpen. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

No. 671. China (Report on the physical commercial, social, and general conditions of Ichang and neighbourhood)

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My

Lords, the task of commending to your Lordship's House a Bill, many of the provisions of which are known to be distasteful to the majority of the House, is at no time an easy or simple one, but on this occasion, in asking your Lordships to give a Second Reading to the Licensing Bill, my task is one of additional difficulty owing to the very special and singular circumstances under which we meet for the purpose. Your Lordships' House is often an assembly of foregone conclusions, but in my experience I never remember an occasion in which the conclusion has been so completely, so palpably, and, I may say, so cynically foregone as it is on this occasion.

I have learned, through what are known as the ordinary channels of information, that your Lordships held a sitting yesterday, not in this Chamber, but in a famous house in a famous square, and that at that sitting a novel stage of this Bill, interposed between the First and Second Readings, was considered. So far as I am able to gather from the published reports, the Bill was very rapidly considered. We hear of guillotine and closure by compartments, but yesterday, so far as I am able to understand, the measure was closured without compartments. I am bound to say that I do not think the manner in which that proceeding was conducted will redound in the country to the credit of your Lordships' House—I will not say as a revising Chamber, but as an assembly which assumes to be deliberative. We shall have, I suppose, to accept the result of that meeting, unless some general epidemic such as overtook the Egyptians in the days of Moses were to fall upon the noble Lords opposite, which for personal reasons we should deeply deplore. We must, I suppose, assume that the Amendment of the noble Marquess will be carried, and even if that unhappy epidemic were to take place, so great are the resources of the noble Marquess opposite that, if, like Pharaoh, he were to harden his heart, I have no doubt he could bring up a fresh host to overwhelm the staunch, but sparse, battalions on these benches.

In spite of what occurred yesterday, I feel it is due to the House, and due also to those who are sitting on these Benches, that we should state our case. I confess, however, that I am tempted to state it in a somewhat different manner from that which I should have employed if the Bill were going to be dealt with on its merits in the ordinary manner. It seems to me it would be reasonable to dwell less upon this, and that clause of the Bill in order, than to say something on the general principles on which the Bill is founded, and on the general effect which will result from setting aside this measure—if your Lordships do so—and leaving things in the condition in which they are at this moment.

My Lords, this measure is designed to attack the most serious and the most tremendous of all our social problems. I may make a quotation from the Majority Report of the Commission of 1899, which has been quoted a hundred times in this controversy, but will bear quotation again. That majority, as your Lordships will remember, contained in its ranks eight gentlemen of the highest character who were themselves interested in the trade. In the course of their Report it was said—

> "A gigantic evil remains to be remedied, and hardly any sacrifice would be too great which would result in a marked diminution of this national degradation."

I turn from that to the Amendment of the noble Marquess, and I see he does not speak of sacrifice. He speaks of inconvenience. "Grave" inconvenience would be caused to many of His Majesty's subjects by the passing of this Bill. My Lords, I do not believe it is possible to engage in any scheme of social reform on any subject without causing inconvenience to some person. Whether your object is better housing of the people, or social improvement in any direction, you cannot proceed without causing inconvenience, and I venture to say that, if this great problem is to be dealt with, there must be, beyond inconvenience, something of that spirit of sacrifice mentioned in the Majority Report. If there is to be a diminution of the drink trade, it must, no doubt, be accompanied by some loss to those who are engaged in it, and it is also undoubtedly true that a serious diminution in the volume of the drink trade will involve a sacrifice of revenue on the part of the nation.

It is said, on the authority of those who have studied this matter closely, that not less than one-sixth of the income of the working classes of this country is spent upon alcoholic drink. That bare statement is in itself, I think, a justification for attempting to deal with the subject. But it is said by some—true, this is a deplorable state of things, but you can do little or nothing by legislation; you must trust to moral agencies, to general social progress and the spread of education, and so forth. Well, I have noticed that those statements are not made by those who conduct the moral agencies of the country. They are made, as a rule, I think, by people who do not themselves take any very active part in promoting social progress. You do not hear those statements from those who spend their lives in working among the poor. I should be very much surprised to hear them—at any rate to any extent—from the right rev. bench, who have practical experience in these matters beyond any which is given to us lay Members of your Lordships' House. It is said you cannot make the people sober by Act of Parliament. It is true, in a sense, that you cannot. You cannot make people moral by Act of Parliament, but that does not prevent your combating open attempts to encourage immorality. The fact is, and surely it is well-known to those who attempt to study social problems, that there is an inter-action between these moral agencies and legislation. They act and re-act on each other and help each other towards the object it is their desire to attain. In this very matter I remember being told by the last Norwegian Minister to this country that he had been greatly impressed by the manner in which temperance legislation and what apparently was a voluntary change in the habits of the people in regard to excessive drinking had gone hand in hand, though it was difficult to say more than that it had been simultaneous, and it was not easy to say precisely what could be put down to the score of one and what to the score of the other. We believe that similar results will be looked for by wise legislation in this country. My Lords, you cannot make people kind by Act of Parliament. Take, for instance, the different Acts of Parliament which have been passed in relation to children. A large part of the benefit of that legislation has not been the punishment of those who are actively cruel to children, but the inculcation of a higher standard and a better habit, and a sense of responsibility which is brought home to people by the fact of the legislation that has been passed. We are told that the licensed trade ought not to be harassed because excessive drinking, or at any rate drunkenness, is as much condemned by the trade, and, indeed, is as hostile to the interests of the trade, as anything can be. I should never doubt for a moment the sincerity of any person engaged either in the wholesale or the retail sale of alcoholic drink who reprehended drunkenness. Far from it, but the mere fact in itself, it seems to me, does not take one very far. If anyone were to ask those who are responsible for the administration of such places as the Casino at Monte Carlo, whether they objected to high play and to people ruining themselves at the tables, I have no doubt they would say with the utmost candour that they did. How much more sensible, they would say, would it be, if instead of ten people coming to lose £1,000 1,000 people came and were prepared to lose a small sum like £10. Similarly no doubt, with the trade in drink. How much more rational if fewer people drank so much and more people drank a smaller amount. But this does not take you very far. What we want to know is whether the licensed trade as a whole is prepared to admit that the volume of the trade ought to be very greatly reduced in the interests of the public. I have no doubt that among those engaged in the trade there are a number who would be willing to agree to a pecuniary sacrifice for this object, but whether it is true of the trade as a whole I confess that I feel some little doubt.

We are at present under the Licensing Act of 1904. That measure must, I suppose, in view of the noble Marques's Amendment, be taken as representing the last word on temperance legislation in this country. We shall have to conduct our affairs, if your Lordships reject the Bill, at any rate for a considerable time to come under the Act of 1904. We opposed the Act of 1904 because we thought that it made it more difficult to cope with this form of national degradation to which the Majority Report referred. But the Act of 1904 did recognise the principle of reduction in the number of public-houses. That principle of reduction we we carry further in the first clause of this Bill. By it we institute a system of statutory general reduction, according to a scale which will be found in the first schedule. The scale is uniform, but it is subject to certain exceptions. Where, for instance, it can be shown that a licence to sell alcoholic drink is merely auxiliary to other purposes; where it can be shown that, as, for instance, in the case of pleasure resorts, there is need for a larger supply owing to a great influx of visitors in the summer months—in such cases provision is made for exceptions to the general standard and the general rule.

On this matter of reduction, there are two arguments which are not exactly compatible with each other, although they are often used by people speaking in the same interest. The first is that reduction in the number of public-houses has no proved relation to the diminution in the amount of drunkenness. What exactly is meant by drunkenness? Some people rely simply and solely on convictions for drunkenness, but I cannot conceive a more fallacious test than that. The real point is: Is there a relation between the reduction in the number of licences and excessive drinking? I believe that the testimony of the police on this point is almost unanimous. You cannot say of a particular place that because one public-house is closed, therefore a wave of sobriety passes over the neighbourhood. But speaking generally, and especially in regard to crowded centres of population, there can be no question that the reduction in the number of licences bears a very real relation to the amount of excessive drinking. After all, it almost stands to reason that it must be so. It is a commonplace of a hundred pulpits—we have heard it over and over again—that particular kinds of temptations, such as those which induce people to drink—temptations, that is to say, which appeal to the senses—are made infinitely more difficult to resist by the multiplication of opportunity. That is a positive platitude; but, at the same time, it goes a long way towards proving this particular case. I would remind the House also that both the Majority and the Minority Report of the Commission of 1899 stated that in their view a large reduction in the number of licences was necessary for the improvement of the condition of the country.

The other argument used against this Bill is that the reduction which is now proceeding under the Act of 1904 makes it needless to do anything to accelerate it. It is said that something like 1,200 licences a year have been reduced in the first three years operation of the Act. Even supposing that to be a sufficient number, which may well be disputed, there are one or two considerations that have to be borne in mind. That reduction is very unequal in its incidence and its inequality is not in proportion to the number of licences held in various places. Further, is there any guarantee that anything like this rate of reduction is likely to continue? In 1907, one licensing authority in five was doing nothing, was taking absolutely no steps at all towards extinguishing licences under the Act of 1904. In Great Yarmouth there is one public-house, including beer-houses, for every 200 inhabitants; that is to say, about one for every fifty adult males; and nothing has been done. In Huntingdonshire there is one public-house, including beer-houses, for just over 100 of the inhabitants, or one for every twenty-five adult males. The licensing authority there have recently informed the Home Office, under the Act of 1904, that they do not intend to impose any compensation levy, or to proceed any further under the Act. I do not know what the local circumstances may be, but the figures are as I have stated. There is no guarantee, indeed, that any licensing authority which is now proceeding with some activity under the Act may not discontinue its efforts at any moment. When therefore people argue that the present reduction ought to be multiplied by fourteen in respect of the next fourteen years, I submit that this is a calculation for which there is no basis whatever.

The reduction is now also an unequal one. It is subject to the peculiar views of the licensing authorities. We propose to institute a national system of reduction. I may mention, in relation to this question of reduction, two points contained in the Bill. One is the provision for what is known as optional reduction—allowing justices of the peace to reduce to a point even beyond the scale if they desire to do so, subject to a point which I will mention directly—that is to say, placing licensing, so far as they are concerned, in the position in which it was before the Act of 1904; and the other is the provision contained in Clause 9, allowing a special further reduction in Wales in consideration of the desire for temperance indicated by many of the inhabitants of that favoured country. But, my Lords, in relation to both of these this has to be borne in mind, that optional reduction and that further reduction can only take place when there is money from the compensation levy sufficient to meet the extra compensation. Now, a national system involves the creation of a central authority; and, therefore, the Bill proposes to create a Licensing Commission. Three gentlemen of standing and merit have been named as Licensing Commissioners. Their business is to approve schemes made by justices of the peace for carrying out statutory reduction, or, in the improbable event of a scheme not being made, of making one themselves. It is also their business to impose a scale of charges for the compensation levy, according to the second Schedule of the Bill. But what they do not do is almost as important as what they do. They do not select the particular licences which are to be extinguished. That duty is left to the justices in consideration of their superior local knowledge, and they do not determine the amount of compensation to be paid. That is determined by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue.

I pass to what may be regarded in some respects as the central point of the Bill, I mean the institution of a time-limit—that is to say, at the end of fourteen years the compensation levy ceases and all licences become subject to the conditions applicable to new licences. In addition to that, a further seven years of respite without payment of compensation levy, but qualified in a manner which I will explain later on, is given to the licence-holder. There is one point I desire to impress on the House, and it is this, that the addition of seven years is of much greater advantage to the trade than the difference between fourteen and twenty-one years. A sinking fund to provide £100 at the end of fourteen years at 4 per cent. would be £5 9s. 4d. To provide the same amount at the end of twenty-one years, at the same rate per cent., the sum necessary is only £3 2s. 7d., so that by the addition of seven years the charge is reduced by something between two-fifths and a half. That is a point which may have escaped the notice of some of your Lordships. The time limit is, of course, bound up with the question of monopoly value. The existence of monopoly value and the fact that it should properly be secured to the community was recognised in the Act of 1904, but only in regard to new licences. Our proposition is to apply it, under conditions, to all licences.

Much argument has taken place as to the nature of a licence. We have, after a great deal of discussion, extracted from the principal opponents of the Bill the statement that a licence is not a freehold, but that it is a property, and apparently a property for more than one year. We prefer to speak of it as a property for one year with an expectation, and it is on those lines that we have dealt with it. After all, it is a very limited kind of property. You cannot sell it, you cannot exchange it, you cannot bequeath it, you must not even give it away; yet at the same time there is no reversion of it in favour of any other person. By law it is an annual gift from the State—not held during good behaviour, because, if it were, there would be no need to come every year for a fresh licence. And, finally, nobody disputes the power which the State or the Government of the day has to make it absolutely valueless, so far as monopoly is concerned, by the indefinite multiplication of licences. In these circumstances can the prospect of renewal be regarded as anything beyond an expectation? One of our complaints against the Act of 1904 was that it attempted to give, and, as far as an Act of Parliament can, until reversed, did give in respect of that mere expectation, something like a vested interest in a licence, and it is in respect of that vested interest we offer the liberal terms of fourteen years plus seven years to those who hold a licence.

It is said that death duties are paid on a licence on the expectation that it would be renewed. The answer to that is, of course, that estate duty is paid on what the value may be at the moment—and what the value may be in a year, or two years, or ten years time, the State does not take any cognisance of. In another place the Prime Minister mentioned the case of a racehorse with great expectations, but a very large sum might have to be paid by way of death duties, although the horse should never win another race. The same principle applies to works of art and articles of jewellery; they are valued according to what they will fetch at the moment, and the licence, therefore, at what the public at the moment believes expectation of renewal to be. But then it is said that in any case it is an unfair and a hard thing to impose a time-limit and to impose concurrently a system of insurance. The argument is that you insure against loss for a term of years, and at the end of the period you are not left with the property which you insured. That also is a very familiar operation. Insurances for limited periods are within the knowledge of all your Lordships, and the argument appears to have no basis, because a hundred parallel cases can easily be found by anybody who cares to look for them.

It is true that the resumption at the end of the period is one of the prime features of this Bill. It is in respect of that resumption that the charges of confiscation and robbery have been so freely levelled at us with such a wealth of imagination and invective. But if it is the case that the licence is not a freehold it must be determinable at some period in some such way as we have proposed. It is open to anybody to criticise the particular method, term, and plan that we have adopted; but after the admission which Mr. Balfour made in another place on the Third Reading—namely, that a time-limit in itself could not be regarded as an unfair proposition—I really think that these charges of robbery and confiscation might be dropped or withdrawn. The charge of robbery is founded, I think, not so much on what would happen to the ordinary trader, be he brewer or licence-holder, but rather on what is supposed to be going to happen to the people who have invested their money in limited companies dealing with these matters.

Joint stock enterprise has done a great deal for this country, though some disadvantages may have attached to it in some of its developments—even such developments as ordinary retail trading, and even banking. But so far as the application of the joint stock principle to the retail sale of drink is concerned, I believe it has been an absolutely unmitigated disadvantage to everybody concerned. To travesty a famous quotation, it is twice cursed. It curses him that takes and him that gives. It has not improved the quality of the article supplied to the public, and it has not added anything, so far as I am aware, to the convenience of the public; but it has caused a great loss to a very large number of people and it has placed a great number of highly respectable people—respectable themselves and worshipping respectability in others—in the position of being obliged, for their own profit, to exploit the vices and the weaknesses of their fellow-countrymen.

One is almost tempted to wonder when one hears of the sanctity attaching to all these shareholders who have invested money in these unhappy enterprises, whether, if other enterprises had been carried on on the joint stock principle, they would have been equally fortunate. We have had at different times Bills dealing with another class of persons—a very hard-working class of people—the street bookmakers, who have received very little sympathy in this House. I cannot help wondering if it had occurred to any of them to float their enterprises on the market, with all the apparatus of preference and ordinary shares—and from what I have heard of the magnitude of their operations some of them might almost have done so—whether, instead of receiving the very short shrift they have received in your Lordships' House, they would have received that overflowing measure of sympathy which you extend to the shareholders who own tied houses. There is another class who were very severely dealt with in this House, a class who, I imagine, may do some service to the public, but whose trade is open to abuses—I mean the money-lenders. I am told they are very apt, while remaining individuals, to describe themselves as companies. I wonder whether, if some of them did become companies, while retaining their profits as individuals, when the Moneylenders' Bill was before the House they would have received the affectionate sympathy of the majority of your Lordships. We all regret that anybody should lose money in unfortunate enterprises. There has been, I am afraid, a very serious loss to many people who could ill afford to lose in connection with these great joint stock enterprises; but it has never been the custom, so far as I know, in your Lordships' House to regard the interests of the weak or foolish shareholder as overriding public advantage and public necessity. No one ever spoke more strongly on that point than the late Lord Salisbury. He often used to warn us that the pity which people must feel for the unfortunate shareholder, if indulged in too freely, may lead us into very deep water indeed.

I pass for a moment to the consideration of another principle contained in this Bill—I mean the modified extent to which the principle of local option is introduced. That, I suppose, is one of the provisions of the Bill which, in the opinion of the noble Marquess, may cause inconvenience to some of His Majesty's subjects. By Part II. of the Bill, new licences of all kinds, on and off, are subjected to local option by a bare majority. That, of course, is a provision which is not of a very far-reaching character, but is of an experimental nature. Then we propose at the end of the fourteen years that there should be a general introduction of the principle of local option by a two-thirds majority, applicable to on but not to off-licences. I am one of those who always believed that local option was a principle that ought to be tried in a matter as difficult as this is, among other experiments which I believe to be of value; and that, I think, is the manner in which local option is probably regarded by the majority of those in favour of temperance reform. There are others, we know, who regard it as the one panacea for the great national evil, but there are probably more who desire to see it applied by way of experiment.

On this question of local option, perhaps I may remind the House of this, that there is a very distinct possibility as matters now stand of the exercise in this country, not of a local option, but of a local veto, because if a landlord objects to alcoholic drinks being sold upon his estate, he has an absolute power of veto. There are cases in which it has been exercised out of regard to the teetotal movement, but it is also exercised in another way by people who are not teetotallers, and do not care for teetotal principles. It is freely exercised by landowners and building speculators in respect of particular neighbourhoods. There are neighbourhoods which our forefathers would have called so genteel that they would not stand a public-house in the immediate neighbourhood. In that case the local veto comes into force without any reference to the wishes or needs of those inhabiting the district, who may not be genteel and who may desire a public-house. I confess that it does seem to me that the existence of these powers, whether they are right or wrong, to a great extent destroys the case against local option as understood and as laid down in this Bill. Whatever may be the objections to a large majority having power to deprive other people, not of drink, but of drinking in a particular way and in a particular place, they seem to me to sink into nothingness by the fact that that power should be exercised potentially, and, indeed, actually, by a single individual or by a small group of individuals.

Now I turn to another matter in which the charge of robbery is freely used, I mean the question of the basis on which compensation under this Bill is to be assessed. It is a highly technical matter, and I do not wish to detain your Lordships long upon it. There has been some dispute as to what was intended on this subject by the Act of 1904, but I do not know that we need trouble ourselves a great deal about that, because we know that the intentions of Parliament do not matter. What matters is what the Act actually says as interpreted by His Majesty's Judges; and in this case the Act has been interpreted by what is familiarly spoken of as the Kennedy judgment, by which compensation became payable, not as was supposed by most to be the case, on the value of the licence as such, but, in addition to that, on the value of the profits earned in the wholesale trade by the brewer who owns the tied houses.

Whatever may be said of tied houses, there can be no doubt of the effect of the Kennedy judgment, that it does give a glorification to the tied house as compared with the free house. If you have two public houses side by side—say the King's Head and the Red Lion, and the King's Head is a tied house in the occupation of a great firm of brewers such as Messrs. Watney, Combe & Company—I mention them as one of the greatest London firms—that is a tied house for the supply of beer and porter. If that house is compulsorily closed, under the Kennedy judgment the compensation payable is not only in respect to the trade done in the house, but also in respect to the loss sustained by Messrs. Watney in the profit upon the porter supplied by them. The other house next door—the "Red Lion"—is a free house, and the owner of it is free to buy where he likes, and supplies, say, the porter produced by Messrs. Guinness & Company. This house is also closed, and all that is received by way of compensation is the compensation for loss of trade done in the house; Messrs. Guinness get nothing. Is that logical? Why should one firm of brewers get compensation in respect of its wholesale profits and not another? What Messrs. Guinness lose is precisely the same advantage as the other firm loses, an outlet for a certain quantity of their wholesale product. Therefore, it is undoubtedly the case that the tied house receives, but only in respect of beer—not in respect of mineral waters and other things—this special recompense. We shall, perhaps, hear from noble Lords who share responsibility for the Act of 1904 what the intentions of Parliament when that Act was passed were, but, so far as my opinion goes, it is very hard to believe that such were their intentions, though it is quite another thing to say and I do not say so for a moment—that as the Act was passed, the judgment of Lord Justice Kennedy, as he now is, is open to cavil on that account.

What we propose is that for purposes of compensation Schedule A of the income-tax—that is to say, what is payable in respect of lands and tenements—should be the scale on which the compensation should be assessed, and I shall await with considerable interest any criticisms upon this particular provision which may attempt to show that Schedule A is an unfair basis to take. It is perfectly true, as the matter now stands, that taking that basis would in individual cases diminish the amount of compensation that would be given, but that is not the point; the point is whether it is in itself unfair to take this as a basis. I will only say this further on this part of the subject, that by Clause 10 we do give a very distinct relief to a class who have, I think, not received quite a fair share of what has been going by way of compensation. I mean the tenants and managers of tied houses; they have not in the past received their due share of the very large compensation given, and by this clause we design a remedy for that.

One charge brought against us is that, although we are persecuting the trade, we do not effect anything by our persecution, that our persecution in any case would be immoral, but conceivably it might be effective. Noble Lords will say it is not even effective, and for this reason, that while we are engaged in harassing vendors of alcoholic drinks in public-houses there will be a great and proportionate increase in the amount of liquor consumed either off the premises or in clubs, and that therefore all our efforts in promoting temperance will be in vain and nugatory. The form in which this charge is generally worded is that this Bill will lead to secret drinking; but I sometimes wonder what exactly is meant by secret drinking as the words are used in this connection. Is it secret drinking if a man drinks in his own house? If that is so, most of us in this House, I am afraid, would be accused of secret drinking; yet the manner in which the charge is brought would lead us to suppose that, if a poor man takes home a bottle of whiskey or a gallon of beer, he is thereby considered to be addicted to secret drinking.

Whatever you may do there will always be a certain amount, even a considerable amount, of really secret drinking by dipsomaniacs, and as a matter of fact there is a good deal of drinking in public-houses in what are called snugs, and places of that kind, which is of a more or less secret character. So much is that objected to in some countries that I believe there are some towns in America where public-houses are obliged to have glass fronts from top to bottom, so that the whole of the premises in which anybody drinks may be in full view from the street, and all who drink there may be seen—like fish in an aquarium. We do not make any proposition of that kind in this Bill. With regard to off-licences I should like to say this. It is sometimes assumed that off-licences have led to encouragement of drinking habits among the people, but I ask noble Lords not to accept that assumption; facts do not lead to that conclusion, and there is very little evidence to prove that grocers' licences have led in any degree to further demoralisation of the habits of the people.

Then I come to a much more difficult question, that of clubs, and I would remind the House—because it is sometimes said that we are leaving clubs altogether alone—that clubs are, I will not say severely, but are very seriously dealt with in various clauses. Clubs are to be subjected, as they have never been subjected before, to annual registration, and one clause is of a very important character, it enables anybody who believes that a club exists mainly for drinking purposes to make representation of his belief to the authority. We have also been told that it is difficult to define what is meant by mainly for drinking purposes, but it is no more difficult to define than hundreds of expressions of a similar kind in various Acts of Parliament, and those who administer the law are quite competent to take all the considerations into account. Then clubs are to be open to inspection, and a fresh responsibility is placed upon the committees who have the conduct of management. I do not know whether your Lordships will say these provisions do not go far enough, but they will have a very direct effect, and, though I hope they will not be regarded as being real hardships to respectable clubs, I know that those who are concerned with the management of working men's clubs regard them as going as far as it is possible to go without undue interference with the liberty of the subject, and further, no doubt, than they would have done themselves if they had had the drafting of the Bill.

Part III. of the Bill deals with miscellaneous matters, and the first has regard to Sunday closing. I was going to say that by common consent—but, I am afraid, nothing in relation to this subject is by common consent—the effects of Sunday closing, where it has been tried, have been uniformly beneficial. At present, in country districts, there are six hours, and in the metropolis seven hours, during which intoxicating liquor can be sold. We propose that the hours should be three and four respectively. But we have endeavoured—and this note, so to speak, is struck all through the Bill—to make it clear that, where alcoholic drink is taken as an adjunct to a meal, and not separately, a more liberal scale of opening ought to be permitted. And that your Lordships will find applies also in this case. The *bona-fide* traveller is subjected to conditions which were suggested, I will not say on his behalf, though that is, perhaps, not a wrong phrase to use, in the reports of the Commission of 1899. The minority, if I remember aright, suggested seven miles and the majority six, and it is the figure of the majority that appears in the Bill.

Then we have a provision for the closing of public-houses during Parliamentary elections. We were in hopes that this, almost alone among the provisions of the Bill, had secured the adhesion of Mr. Balfour. He did, I believe, express himself at one moment in its favour, but other counsels prevailed, and I believe he voted against it when a division was taken on the subject later. Then there are several provisions of value relating to the presence of children in public-houses, and Clause 22, which, in our opinion, is a clause of the very highest use, in that it empowers the magistrates to impose conditions of various kinds on those who apply for a licence. The flexibility of that provision is, in our mind, of the greatest possible value.

I suppose it will be said, in the course of this debate, that this measure has never been properly considered, and that it received only hurried Parliamentary attention. So far as these attacks are concerned, I can assure your Lordships, from personal knowledge, that it has been most amply considered. The measure was, for many months, the subject of the closest inquiry, and the most careful piecing together. As regards the question whether it was hurried through Parliament, I suppose we are not likely to agree. I should have thought that six weeks of Parliamentary time was not an inadequate term for the consideration of even such an important measure as this. I cannot help thinking that, if it had been found possible—I suppose it never is found possible in the case of a very contentious Bill—to condense and concentrate discussion on the points really at issue, that time would have amply sufficed; but, as we know, concentration is difficult. Sometimes long speeches are made on very small points; and under the system of closure by compartment, which is utilised by both parties, though both parties alike admit it to be an imperfect machine, it does seem to be almost inevitable that some points escape full notice. But, so far as I am able to judge, having followed the debates in another place, all the main points of real importance did receive a very full and fair measure of discussion, and I shall be surprised if any new light is thrown on any of them even by the most experienced intellects in your Lordships' House.

It appears, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, from the Motion on the Paper, and we must assume it will be carried, that this Bill will be lost. Your Lordships might have decided to amend certain of its provisions, and I do not think you will find it altogether easy to prove to the country why you did not adopt that course. This is not exclusively, or entirely, a party question, and, although the party line divides us pretty clearly, yet I think that line is somewhat irregular here and there. Although we are regularly arrayed against each other in this matter in this House, yet I cannot help thinking that there are in the country not a small number of those who regularly support noble Lords opposite who will not entirely welcome the rejection of this Bill if your Lorsdhips decide to reject it.

There are certain elements on our side quite distinct from those who ordinarily support us. Those who support us as a rule in the country have shown that they feel deeply on this matter. I myself have received upwards of 2,000 Resolutions in relation to this Bill and some 1,400 petitions. But there are others. The clergy both of the Church of England and of the Church of Rome—and I believe we shall hear from the right rev. bench, who speak with a voice of authority—will, as I believe, speaking generally, deeply regret the loss of a measure of this kind. Quite apart from this, I believe there are a number of serious citizens, people not very closely wedded to either political party, but as a rule, supporters of the party opposite rather than of ours, who will deplore the fact that this effort on behalf of temperance has broken down. They may, perhaps, not like this or that provision in the Bill. They may think this clause harsh; they may think that other clause inadequate. But, when it comes to concluding that nothing is to be done, and when no suggestion for improvement or Amendment to the Bill is offered. I cannot help thinking that they will be rather on our side than on that of noble Lords opposite. There are some words of my noble friend on the cross benches, Lord Rosebery, which have often been quoted—

> "If the State does not soon control the liquor traffic, the liquor traffic will soon control the State."

I cannot help thinking that the rejection of this Bill, if your Lordships mean to reject it, will bring us a stage nearer to that unhappy consumation, so disastrous to the commonwealth and so ignominious to the leaders of public opinion in this country. Speaking for ourselves, I can only say that we shall never regret the efforts which we have made to avert that consummation by bringing in this Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE, who had given notice on the Motion for the Second Reading, to move the following Resolution, viz.—

> "That this House, while ready to consider favourably any amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill,"

said: My Lords, in the observations which I shall have to address to your Lordships, I shall endeavour to imitate the noble Earl who has just sat down in the calmness and self-restraint with which he has dealt with this important subject. He has spoken to-night more in sorrow than in anger. Indeed, there was only one passage in his speech in which I thought I detected a little outburst of mild indignation. It was the opening passage in which he took us to task for having confronted your Lordships' House this evening with what he called a cynically foregone conclusion.

The noble Earl proceeded to indulge in a few pleasantries—I should, if the word exists, be almost inclined to say, "unpleasantries"—at the expense of the meeting which took place under my roof yesterday. The noble Earl is greatly shocked at that meeting. I should like to ask where and amongst what paragons of political propriety the noble Earl has been living all these years? Has he never heard of a party meeting to discuss the manner in which an important measure should be treated? I am quite sure that I could, without very much difficulty, bring to his notice a considerable number of cases, if time were given for the necessary research, and owing to the kindness of a friend who sits by me, I am able to give him this evening one case which seems to be not wholly irrelevant.

In 1886, when the Home Rule Bill was before Parliament, Mr. Gladstone called a meeting of Liberals, the circular convening the meeting being addressed only to those who were known to be prepared to vote in favour of the establishment of a legislative body in Dublin. Now, my doors were open to all. There was no foregone conclusion; there was a good deal of free and not entirely unanimous discussion. At the meeting to which I refer Mr. Gladstone, among other remarks, argued that Members who did not altogether agree with the Bill might still vote for the Second Reading, and see to its amendment in Committee. No such terms were suggested or imposed upon those who honoured me with their presence yesterday. This Bill moreover has been so thoroughly discussed both in and out of Parliament that my friends who joined me yesterday may surely be excused if, having the whole case before them, they took counsel together as to the manner in which the Motion for the Second Reading of this Bill should be met to-night.

I conceive that there are two questions to which we have to address ourselves this evening. Is new legislation dealing with the liquor traffic necessary, and, if so, is the legislation proposed by His Majesty's Government of an appropriate and admissible kind? The noble Earl asked us whether in our opinion the Act of 1904 was the last word upon this subject. I am very far indeed from contending that the Act of 1904 closed the chapter of temperance legislation. I am quite ready to admit that, in regard to such points as the acceleration of the reduction of licences in places where it can be clearly shown that that acceleration has not been sufficiently rapid, further legislation may be necessary, and it has always seemed to me that there was a great deal to be said in regard to the incidence of the taxation which at present falls upon licensed property. But of this, at any rate, I am sure—that any well-considered measure for the promotion of temperance would be dealt with in a sympathetic spirit and with an open mind on this side of the House, as well as upon the other. Not that I am ready to admit that intemperance is increasing in this country. I do not believe that it is. I believe that statistics prove the contrary. But I do admit that this great question of excessive drinking does underlie a number of the most serious social problems with which Parliament has to deal. It is connected with the question of crime, with the question of disease, and with the question of the degeneracy of the population in the most crowded centres of industry. It is connected, I think, even with the question of unemployment which so largely occupies our thoughts at the present time. And, therefore, I, at any rate, should welcome with open arms any measure which I really believed to represent a complete and well-considered effort to diminish the evils of excessive drinking.

I ask myself whether the Bill on the Table can really be described as such a measure. My Lords, I find in it nothing like what could be described as a frontal attack all along the line upon intemperance. I find in it rather a congeries of proposals, hastily put together, representing not so much a deliberate policy as the tenets—the somewhat motley tenets—of those who are the most insistent advocates of temperance legislation. This Bill is directed almost entirely to dealing with a single feature of the problem: I mean the connection between excess in drinking and excess in the number of licensed premises. Now, these two things certainly do not always stand to one another in the relation of cause and effect. You may have districts where drunkenness is very common and where licensed premises are few in number, and, conversely, you may have districts with a large number of licensed premises and a clean record so far as excessive drinking is concerned. It is only those who may be described as local experts, who know the circumstances of the neighbourhood and of the licensed premises in question, who are able to tell you whether the number of those premises has or has not anything to do with the prevalence of drunkenness. And observe that it is precisely the opinion of those local experts which this Bill is designed to set on one side.

My Lords, I have seen a great deal of evidence to show that one of the results of a great diminution in the number of licensed premises is the stimulation of what I will term gregarious drinking—a form of drinking which I believe to be very dangerous, under which an enormous number of people collect on the same premises, where they are encouraged by the example of those around them to drink, and where, unless I am misinformed, a man who does not order something to drink is made to leave the place to make room for some one who will order drink. At any rate, I suggest that the theory that the reduction in the number of licensed premises inevitably leads to the diminution of drunkenness is wholly inconsistent with the theory of this Bill, that those who hold licences which are to be allowed to survive under the new system are to recoup themselves and to gain great advantage by the suppression of competing premises.

This Bill deals, then, mainly with the question of the reduction of licences said to be redundant. On the other hand, it neglects altogether a great part of what may be called the field of temperance reform. There are surely two sets of persons to be considered if you want to put a stop to excessive drinking. There is the person who sells the drink and the person who consumes the drink. This Bill deals almost entirely with the sellers and very little with the consumers. Again, it leaves on one side what I might almost term the real public-house question, the question which was raised the other evening by my noble friend Lord Lamington—whether it is not possible to do something to humanise the public-houses, to encourage the use of lighter and less deleterious drinks, and to promote reasonable recreation of a kind which is not allowed at an English public-house.

There is another portion of the field of temperance which the Bill no doubt touches, but touches in a very inadequate manner. I mean the question of clubs. If there is one law which can be laid down, it is that in this as in other countries a marked diminution in the number of public-houses leads to an equally marked increase in the number of clubs. This Bill contains some provisions in regard to clubs which are no doubt of some value. I do not wish to underrate their importance. They are useful provisions in their way, but they do not in any way countervail the enormous advantages which, under our present system, and still more under the Government Bill, the club enjoys as against the public-house.

May I remind your Lordships of one or two of them? The club, to begin with, escapes altogether that local option which figures conspicuously throughout this Bill. The club pays a registration fee of 5s.; the public-house pays for a licence a sum which may range from £4 10s. to £60. The club profits by the reduction of public-houses, but pays nothing towards the compensation by which that reduction is brought about; while the owner of the licensed house has constantly to contribute to the compensation levy. The club may do what it likes with its own premises; the owner of the public-house is under very severe restrictions as to any alteration or improvements he may desire to make. The club is not specially rated on account of the privileges it enjoys; the public-house is specially rated; and finally, whilst the club may introduce games and music, the public-house is forbidden such accessories. Is it not clear that to deal as severely as we do in this Bill with the public-houses while allowing the clubs to escape, as lightly as they will escape, is really to neglect one very important feature in this great question?

I do not know whether your Lordships have seen a book recently published by Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell. It is full of valuable information, and there is an extremely interesting passage on the subject of clubs. The authors give a table showing the expenditure of 540 clubs. Nearly half a million is spent by them, but nearly all the money is spent on alcoholic liquors. There is one club mentioned—I presume as a typical, if extreme, case—where the takings at the bar amount to £2,690, whereas the takings for newspapers were 10s., and the takings for bread 3s. 7d. I never expected to encounter in modern life so complete a counterpart of Prince Henry's immortal comment on the tavern bill found in the pocket of the sleeping Falstaff—

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

> "O monstrous! but one halfpennyworth of bread to this intolerable deal of sack."

The noble Earl told us, however, that the Government intended that clubs used mainly as drinking clubs should be adequately dealt with. I thought that I detected in his observations a little uneasiness as to that definition. It seems to me to be an extraordinarily woolly definition, and one I am afraid which is rather characteristic of the vague language which we are so fond of inserting in Acts of Parliament. What is a club "mainly used" for drinking purposes? As in the case of the club I have mentioned, there may be a very large consumption of liquor; but it is conceivable that members may frequent the premises for the pleasure of each other's society, perhaps for the pleasure of discussion, or other innocuous purposes. I am at any rate unconvinced that this definition will serve the purpose which the noble Earl expects of it.

Another part of the field which is largely neglected by this Bill is the provision in respect of off-licences. Unless I misunderstand the Bill, these do not come under any rigid scale, such as that which applies to on-licences, and they enjoy various other immunities. The noble Earl dealt with the question of off-licences and made light of the drinking which results from them. He said that the charge against them was "not proven." I am bound to say that the information I have received is of an opposite description. I am told that there is nothing which more stimulates the most insidious forms of secret drinking than the facility with which spirits can be obtained, a bottle at a time, from the grocers' shops.

This Bill is then mainly a reduction Bill. Now as to the policy of reduction, I venture to suggest that it is a policy which is wise or foolish according as it is applied with or without discrimination. By discrimination I mean this, that it is good to reduce licences if you can make sure that the licensed premises you are getting rid of are really redundant; that they are places, in which for local reasons, it is not desirable that drinking should be allowed to be carried on. But I distinguish altogether between reduction of that kind and a merely arbitrary reduction simply because the number of licences in a particular neighbourhood exceeds the fixed canon which you have laid down by your Schedule. On the initiative of the late Government in 1904, Parliament dealt with this question of the reduction of licences. We passed by a majority of three to one an Act under which it was rendered possible to reduce the superfluous licences, and under which the task of reduction was entrusted to the authority most competent to perform it. I mean the local magistrates aided by the Quarter Sessions. We did this on a system of mutual insurance, which, I believe, has operated very fairly, and we left the holders of the licences which were not suppressed in a position of reasonable security for the future.

Is it true that the Act of 1904 has failed so completely that it is necessary for us to substitute for it another and wholly different Bill? I do not think so. I believe that the Act of 1904 conferred an inestimable service on the public in this, that it enabled the magistrates without scruple to get rid of licences whenever they were satisfied that such licences were redundant. I cannot describe the operation of the Act better than by quoting the words used by the Prime Minister in reference to another Bill that came before Parliament in the previous year. Mr. Asquith said—

> "The justices find an excessive number of public-houses in a district and that the licensees are conducting their business in a perfectly legitimate manner. The justices are in a dilemma; either they must hold their hands and not do what the public interest clearly requires by reducing the number of licences, or they must select a victim or a series of victims among this innocent class of persons. That is a most invidious duty. I do not wonder that the consequence is that the justices do very often hold their hands when the public interest requires that they should act."

The Act of 1904 had this great merit, that it extricated the magistrates from the dilemma which Mr. Asquith so well described. Acting on the discretion thus given them the magistrates have made very large reductions in the number of licences. I believe they have reduced them at the rate of something like 1,500 a year and of the amount allowed for compensation no less than 95 per cent. has already been spent.

It is true that there are reasons why the progress should not in the future be so rapid as in the past. But one obstacle has been interposed, not owing to any shortcoming in the Act, but owing to the administrative action of the Government, who have, unless I am misinformed, withheld their consent to borrowing by those local authorities who wished by this means further to expedite the process of reduction. At any rate, we know that there are some districts in which the reductions have already brought the number of licences down to the level of the present Bill; I hope therefore, it will be admitted that the Act of 1904 was a valuable measure, and if there is any reason to believe that its operation has been obstructed and that there are recalcitrant benches, it should not be beyond our powers to stimulate their action; but for that purpose I do not think that the Bill on the Table is by any means the machinery we should use.

The Bill of 1908, indeed, is something wholly different from the Act of 1904. In the first place, I find in this Bill that for the discretion of the licensing magistrates we are asked to substitute a cast-iron scale imposed uniformly on the whole country. No sufficient regard, as I read the Bill, is paid to local peculiarities or local convenience. It is a measure which, breathes intolerance from one end to the other. There is no power of setting a superfluity of licensed premises in one district against a deficiency in another district. The uniform rigid scale of the Government has apparently been arrived at without previous inquiry as to the manner in which it will fit the requirements of different parts of the country. The result is that we hear on every side of hard cases which will arise if the Bill becomes law. There are hard cases in the great cities where one ward may find itself with an ample number of licensed premises and another without any licensed premises at all There are harder cases still in the rural districts, and I think the rural districts are entitled to our sympathy. The case of townsmen is very different from the case of the agricultural labourers. The townsman has many places to which he can resort for distraction and amusement; the agricultural labourer probably has his public-house and nothing else. When, therefore, in a country district you put an end to the existence of three public-houses out of four you do occasion what I venture to call a grave inconvenience to a number of perfectly innocent people who have been in the habit of frequenting these houses. I am told of a district where under this Bill five public-houses would be left to an area of seventy-eight square miles. [Laughter.] Your Lordships laugh; but to the wretched labourer who, at the end of a hard day's work, wants to get his mug of beer, it is by no means a laughing matter that he should have to trudge seven or eight miles across country on a winter's evening.

I pass to the provision which deals with the tribunal, and here I must say that I view with ever-increasing apprehension the growing practice of creating new tribunals of this kind. They are tribunals improvised *ad hoc*, manned by gentlemen of undoubted respectability, usually gentlemen of a certain political complexion, who are remunerated by salaries which are probably not sufficient to attract men of first-rate position, although the work they have to do is of first-rate importance. Why is it that we are to distrust the magistrates? I want to give the magistrates a little testimonial from the same source as the quotation which I read to the House a moment ago. In the same debate Mr. Asquith, dealing with the Licensing Bill presented by Mr. Butcher in 1903, complained that the effect of the Bill was for all practical purposes to annihilate the discretion which the law at present gives to the justices. That is just what we complain of in this Bill, that it weakens and diminishes the responsibility which the present law gives to the justices. And I hope your Lordships will remember that from this newly invented triumvirate there is no appeal.

Now, my Lords, let me ask how under this new dispensation the victims are likely to fare. The noble Earl gave an interesting disquisition on the nature of a licence-holder's interest. I use the word "interest" advisedly, because I shall be corrected if I use the word "property." But is there no such thing as an interest stopping short of a freehold and yet going far beyond a tenancy at will—which can be measured in terms of money and which deserves to be treated as a substantial and durable interest? Colleagues of the noble Earl have spoken of the licence-holder's interest as a precarious interest. That has not been the view of learned Judges, of Lord Halsbury, of Lord Bramwell, of Lord Hannen, and others. The noble Earl admitted that these licences were highly valued for death duties, but he said that this proved nothing, because the Somerset House authorities valued property at whatever value it happened to possess at the moment of valuation, and that what was valuable at one moment might cease to be valuable at another. But does the noble Earl suggest to us that it is right for the State to act at one moment on the assumption that a licence of this kind is a valuable interest in respect of which high duties should bepaid to itself, and a few months afterwards to say—Oh, no; this is a precarious licence of which you have no tenure and in respect of which you are not entitled to ask any compensation to speak of?

Again I fall back upon the authority of the present Prime Minister. In the same debate Mr. Asquith, speaking of the licence-holder's interest said—

> "When it is said, as it is said, and properly said, that it is a judicial discretion, what is meant is not a discretion to be exercised as in litigation according to settled rules of law and methods of procedure, but a discretion exercised in a judicial temper, not capriciously or whimsically, not in deference to any preconceived theory or formula, but upon a full consideration of all the relevant facts which affect particular cases."

Now we have got the preconceived formula, and we know the result. In spite however of the noble Earl's refinements upon this point I do not gather that he would himself repudiate the claim of the licence-holder to what I should call equitable compensation. The difference between us is this—What is and what is not equitable compensation? It is admitted by the noble Earl that the licence-holder enjoyed a certain expectation as to the renewal of his licence. What is the "expectation" worth?

I have seen rather interesting figures which bear upon this point. In 1900 there were in round figures 102,000 on-licences. of these 131 were refused—hardly any on grounds of redundancy. That works out at odds of 700 to one on renewal That surely does show that the interest of the licence-holder is a substantial interest. I would add that in this country Parliament has always been careful to deal scrupulously with interests of this kind. I could give your Lordships examples. Do you remember how we dealt with the officers who had paid over regulation prices for their commissions? That was a clear case where something had grown up outside the law, where the parties had an expectation, and where the legislation dealt with that expectation in a most equitable and generous spirit. Another case in point is the manner in which we dealt with the question of the Ulster tenants where an "expectation" prevailed, and was stereotyped and recognised by the law.

How are the persons having this reasonable expectation likely to fare under the provisions of this Bill? I will take that portion of them who will lose their licence whilst the fourteen years are running, and who will receive compensation for their loss. Until now that compensation has been based upon market value, but under this Bill market value disappears and you have substituted for it the difference in value of the premises with or without a licence as assessed under Schedule A of the income-tax. That proposal to bring in the question of rateable value was condemned in terms by the Peel Commission. They reported against rateable value on the ground that if it be admitted the licence holder's goodwill cannot be considered, although they say—

> "The licence and the goodwill are the things for which compensation would be given, not the building, which the owner would retain."

Now, we have had a considerable amount of explanation as to the manner in which this goodwill is to be calculated. We have heard from the Prime Minister that under this Bill what is called personal goodwill will escape, whereas local goodwill be taken into account. How are you going to distinguish between personal and local goodwill? What are the things which enter into goodwill? Surely among the constituents of goodwill may be mentioned the attractiveness of the premises, the quality of the liquor known to be sold in them, and the *clientèle* which frequents the particular house. All these things are the creation of the licensee's own efforts, and why is he to be deprived of them? I am very much afraid that when you get down to the bed-rock of these provisions, you will find that the only personal goodwill which the licence owner will be allowed to retain will be that kind of personal popularity which belongs to the popular football player or cricketer: a goodwill of which even His Majesty's Government would not be able to strip him.

So much for the fate of those licence-holders who will be deprived of their licences during the fourteen years. But now let us consider what will be the fate of those who survive the fourteen years and enter upon that further period of seven years which the noble Earl described as a respite. During the fourteen years the licence-holder has been continually putting his hand in his pocket to provide compensation for those licence-holders who find themselves suppressed, and the money he pays, remember, may go to compensate licence-holders in some area far removed from his own, so that he will not receive a single penny of advantage from what is spoken of as the betterment due to the diminution in the number of licences. Then after fourteen years comes the period of respite, a respite that seems to me of very questionable advantage. It is a respite in this sense, that the licence-holder will cease to contribute to the compensation levy—but during the respite he is liable to be deprived of his licence altogether under the system of local option introduced in the Bill and his security is gone. He may be deprived of it either by the action of the local bench or by a two-thirds majority of the ratepayers. Finally, he may have imposed upon him conditions which would virtually confiscate a great part of his property.

Then we come to the third stage, after the twenty-one years. What happens then? The whole of the monopoly value of his licence is taken away from him and annexed by the State, although the State has not contributed a farthing towards the cost of the operation. His goodwill, the result of his own hard work and energy, disappears and he is neither better nor worse off than any casual competitor who may appear upon the scene. I spoke just now of the extraordinary vagueness of the language of the Bill. I wish some noble Lord, before this debate closes, would give us some explanation of what is really meant by monopoly value. I should like to read the new definition. It has been altered several times, and I will read it—

> "The monopoly value shall be taken to be the sum by which, in the opinion of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, the value of the premises, as adopted or estimated for the purpose of income-tax under Schedule A, when licensed, and without taking into consideration any provisions for the purpose of securing to the public the monopoly value, exceeds the value of the premises for that purpose when not licensed."

What a strange farrago to hurl at the heads of the trade and the public! I hope we shall have an exegesis from some noble Lord of the clause defining monopoly value. But although the words are obscure I am very much afraid that the meaning and intentions of the Government are quite plain. I understand that what the Government have in view is that the public should take the whole of the difference between the income-tax assessment of premises when licensed and unlicensed, and that not one penny is to be given in consideration of goodwill. These are what the noble Earl in the course of his speech described as the "liberal terms" offered to licence-holders under the Bill. There is no real compensation under this Bill. The holders of the suppressed licences will not get adequate compensation, and the holders of the surviving licences will not get adequate compensation. Indeed, it has been publicly stated that under these clauses something like 80 per cent. of the property of these people will be taken from them under this Bill. That calculation holds the field, and I should be glad to have it corrected if it is wrong. There is one point that I omitted in regard to the so-called "compensation" offered by His Majesty's Government. I believe it is expected that during the seven years respite the holders of these licences are to recoup themselves by the amount of the business which they will do; in other words, I suppose they are to push their trade as hard as they can, to put as much water in their liquor as the public will stand, and spend nothing on the improvement of the premises. Do not let us forget that these terms, which I venture to stigmatise, putting it gently, as most niggardly terms, may not be received at all by the victims should it happen to be the case that local option is put into operation against them. I am constrained to say that in my opinion these terms spell absolute ruin for the holders of licensed premises. If it is true, as I am informed, that the Bill leaves the sufferers with only something like 20 per cent. of the value of the interest which they now enjoy, I do not think we use too strong language when we say that these proposals are of a confiscatory description.

But, my Lords, we have to consider not only the members of the trade who will suffer. The noble Earl talked seriously about the evils of the joint stock system. I daresay he is quite right. Perhaps the evils are far-reaching; but that does not alter the fact that if this Bill becomes law, not only the trade, but an immense number of innocent investors in a perfectly legitimate business will be deprived of a great portion of their property. I do not think it is possible to exaggerate the cruelty of such legislation or to dwell too much on the serious effect which it cannot fail to have upon public confidence in this country.

And now, my Lords, how are we to deal with this Bill? I do not think any of those who sit on this side of the House would entertain for a moment the idea of allowing it to pass as it stands. Are we then to amend it or are we to reject it? I freely admit that there are many considerations which at first sight attract me to the first of these courses. The House of Commons has devoted something like six weeks to the consideration of the Bill, and it will be a matter of regret to many of us to think that their labours should be in vain. There is another reason, and it is this: that much advantage might be got from the discussion of the Bill in Committee, for it contains many provisions which we should be much better able to criticise and dissect if we could get to close quarters with them in Committee. But the consideration which weighs most with me is that we should, by reading this Bill a second time, meet the earnest wishes of a very large section of our countrymen who, being passionately devoted to the cause of temperance, will undoubtedly view with great regret the rejection of a measure with the details of which they are probably quite unfamiliar, but which has been represented to them to be, and which they believe to be, a temperance measure. Therefore, it is not without much hesitation that I have arrived at the conclusion which it is my duty to lay before the House.

But I am deeply convinced that it is altogether beyond our power on this side of the House to convert this Bill by amendment in Committee into a Bill which we could possibly accept. Our objections are directed, not to points of detail, but to the fundamental principles of the Bill, and I venture to say it is not our business to tear up the Bill of the Government and to send down to the House of Commons an entirely different Bill of our own composition. The attitude of His Majesty's Government has shown clearly that in their view the proposals which I have tried to criticise to-night are essential to the fabric of the Bill, and it is to my mind quite inconceivable that they should accept the kind of alterations on which those sitting behind me would, I believe, be likely to insist.

And there is one other matter which weighs very much with me and which has strengthened me in the conclusion at which I have arrived. I believe it would be impossible for your Lordships to modify the essential provisions of this Bill without coming into conflict with the privilege of the House of Commons. Most of the more important clauses, I am advised, touch the question of privilege. Now your Lordships have had an object-lesson during the present year as to the manner in which the privilege of the House of Commons can be pleaded by His Majesty's Ministers. We have not forgotten the fate of our Amendments to the Old-Age Pensions Bill. Many of them were proposals genuinely designed for the purpose of improving the Bill, but they were thrown back in our faces because His Majesty's Ministers chose to apply to the case an interpretation of the doctrine of privilege going far beyond anything of which we had up to that time heard.

You cannot plead privilege in July and switch it off in December. Therefore in fairness to ourselves I recommend yout Lordships to take a stand upon our rooted objection to the principles of this Bill rather than entangle ourselves in a mass of subsidiary points amid which the real issues would be obscured. I believe the country looks to us to protect it from legislation which we believe to be iniquitous and ill-considered, and I believe we shall better deserve both the respect of our fellow-countrymen and our own self-respect if straightforwardly and with the courage of our opinions, we reject the Bill on its Second Reading.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that' for the purpose of inserting the words 'this House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

*Lord RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, I do not propose to stand long between noble Lords on the other side who wish to reinforce, if reinforcement were possible, the arguments which have fallen from the noble Marquess, and noble Lords on this side who wish to combat them. But I should like to take this opportunity of stating how this Bill strikes an average individual who does not hold the views taken by noble Lords opposite, and who also has not imbibed, to the dregs all the details in the provisions of the measure.

It was with surprise and regret that I learnt that the noble Marquess and his friends had declined to undertake the task of amending the Bill on the ground that that would be tantamount to an acceptance of its principles. I will not follow the noble Marquess into what he said regarding the question of privilege, but I will deal for a moment with the question of principle. As between the principle of the Act of 1904 and the principle of this Bill; the Act of 1904 provides for a reduction of licences upon certain terms, and for recovery of State control—with provisions for payment of full monopoly value for grants of new annual licences. This Bill proceeds on the same lines 'plus' the time limit and easier terms as to the monopoly value. Thus I find no cardinal differences in principle; the differences between us turn upon the terms and the equity and effectiveness of the methods—matters of details for Committee; and I regret that the noble Marquess opposite should have asked the House to depart from its traditional duty at a time when its suggestions and guidance would have been most valuable. This Bill seems to me to offer a reasonable compromise between what I will call the out-and-outers on the temperance side and the out-and-outers on the trade side. Because what we always sententiously call this problem lends itself easily to digressions. I will stick to what I conceive to be the three main features which emerge from the Bill before us. These I take to be in the first place the speedy extinction of a large proportion of the public-houses throughout the country, the second I take to be the ultimate resumption by the State of the control and to some extent of the profit arising from the possession of a valuable monopoly, and the third I take to be the creation of an intermediate period during which it is hoped that the industry affected will accommodate itself financially to the new conditions under which it will have to carry on its business.

Now I take the first main point. I think the noble Marquess just now admitted, and I think everybody agreed, that there is a considerable superfluity of public-houses, and that probably, though public-houses are generally well kept and tidy, and in fact rather agreeable looking objects in the landscape, the objection to them, if any, is that if there are too many, it must lead to more drinking; by parity of reasoning, if you have rather fewer there would be a reasonable chance of having a little less drinking. The noble Marquess touched on that, and he touched on it in a way that I rather expected. He attached very little importance to resolutions passed by temperance and friendly societies, and he said that those were the sort of things that it was always possible to fake up, and that even if they were sincere they were based, as the noble Marquess said the Bill was, on wrong principles.

I think the best thing I remember being said about this was said by the late Lord Salisbury, and like everything else that he said it was the best thing of its kind: it was this, that although he had a great many bedrooms at Hatfield, he did not find that that led to his sleeping more. I believe someone pointed out that the analogy was not quite good, but I am not quite sure that the audience quite appreciated the irony of the noble Marquess's observations. Anyhow I will not dwell on the failure of that analogy, but I will give you another which also belongs to vegetation of the chestnut order, to wit, that of the poor woman who said that she could get her husband past four public-houses, but she could not get him past the fifth. That is no doubt a little rougher in fibre than Lord Salisbury's, but it is at least as effective, and probably as true. Without labouring these points any further, I should like to say, speaking for myself, which is all I am speaking for, that I welcome the provisions which are contained in this Bill, which make for a further reduction in public-houses. I am perfectly willing to defer, as we all must defer, to experts, but I confess I like my own opinion quite as much on this particular point. I live up in the north of England where we have very bad weather and like lots of drink to keep it in order, and I trust to my own observations on this quite as much as I do those of the local expert of whom the noble Marquess made so much as being a sort of pope, who could instruct us as to whether public-houses made for sobriety or not.

Then as to the scheme for compensation. I will not talk about that, because that seems to me again a matter that has been conceded by both parties, that the trade have got to compensate themselves. I do not know whether the provisions in the Bill are quite what I would like to see in it with regard to that, but there, again, that is a point for Committee, and by the unfortunate action which you have taken, you have contracted yourselves out of doing anything in that direction or about anything else.

The same remark applies to clubs. Lord Lansdowne talked about the registration and the regulation and the inspection of clubs as desirable, and that all this was not sufficiently provided for in the Bill. But that is all a question of method and degree, and there, again, those also are matters for Committee. We have heard also something about local option, and upon that point I would say, *quot homines, tot sententiæ.* But as regards local option in this Bill, local option is only an episode in it, and the provisions in that regard are in no way vital to the Second Reading of the Bill. You can take the whole of those clauses out, and still leave a complete measure for readjusting the relations between the brewing industry and the State. Local option is not vital, or in any sense vital, to the Second Reading of the Bill which you have just moved is not to be given. The same remark applies, of course, to such points as children being admitted to bars, and various other clauses. Those are all Committee points.

I should like to say one word with regard to Sunday closing. I like the regulations about Sunday closing, and if I may be allowed I should like to tell you the *modus operandi* which goes on in my village, which would be defeated, I think to the advantage of the neighbourhood generally, and certainly to my own, if the Sunday closing clauses became law. I live in a village which is looked upon as agreeably rural, but we are near a small manufacturing town, a very self-contained thriving place, I believe it has got one of the best technical schools in the West Riding of Yorkshire, which is saying a good deal, but at all events there it is, a small urban town as you sometimes find in the middle of a sea of grass. They have a very efficient and simple and ingenious way of managing the Sunday closing. This place is just within the three-mile limit of my village, and what happens is that at half-past two on every Sunday afternoon, which is closing-time at the urban place, a 'bus is in readiness, and very often two or three 'buses, or as many 'buses as are likely to be required, to bring over at once to my village these people who have vacated the public-house at half-past two. They bring them over, and they spend the whole afternoon in my village, and just get back in time to the place they came from by six o'clock, when they can begin drinking over again. If this became law we, no doubt, up in our part of the world, would get rid of a good many people, very good people in their way, but who certainly add a good deal to the business at the Court House at Bolton-by-Bowland every fortnight, and who get into trouble through the services of these 'buses, which bring them on Sunday to Gisburne.

Now I will come to the second main feature—I said I would try to stick to the main features—which is the resumption by the State of the control of the monopoly value. Here, as I said at the beginning, I do not imbibe quite to the dregs all the methods and all the provisions of the Bill as laid down by His Majesty's Government, and if this Bill had been given a Second Reading I should have liked to have said a word in favour of some preference being given to the licensees and owners who at the expiration of the time-limit should survive the tests and the trials and the levies and the undreamt of inconveniences to which they would have been subjected, no doubt sincerely in the interests of the community. I really think that this Old Guard, as it were, should be given some sort of pull over the new and untried speculator who decided to come in against them into the licensing business, possibly one incentive of his action being the chance of buying at a wreckage price the premises which he stepped into, having got rid of this stanch gentleman who, as I said just now, belonged to the Old Guard. It would have been perfectly possible to have drawn clauses to protect those individuals, and, although I do not pretend to be a Parliamentary draughtsman, if we had got into Committee I should have had the hardihood to try and draw it.

I said just now that I would say something about the monopoly value as affected by this Bill, and as affected by the Act of 1904, and I should like to point out that under Clause 26 of this Bill the licensee is placed in a very much better position than he was under the clause in the Act of 1904. He becomes the recipient of better conditions, I think perfectly fair ones. I should like to remind your Lordships that the noble Marquess was very enamoured with the individuals who under the 1904 Act were to decide all these questions, but curiously enough though you had such confidence in the people who were to decide all these questions you gave them no sort of discretion as to this monopoly value, and however good a case was shown the justices were obliged to claim to the very last farthing that monopoly value. Under the Bill of the present Government the Commissioners of Inland Revenue can remit part, on good cause shown, of an annual licence. I have no doubt, as the noble Lord said, that Clause 6 is difficult to understand. I do not know that I am right about the words, but that is the meaning which I understand is contained in the words "when in such cases" the payments shall not exceed the monopoly value, "whereas on re-grant for a term of years they are to be based on monopoly value." But as I have said just now, in both cases the words do not seem to me to be very clear, and again if we had ever got into Committee I should have asked the Government myself to try and clear that up a little.

Then we come to my third main point or feature. I should like to say a word here about those of whom we have heard a good deal, those who have invested their savings in the brewing industry, seduced, I suppose from their allegiance to what I think Lord Stowell called the elegant simplicity of the 3 per cents. I suppose the capital invested in the brewery industry enterprises of this country amounts to something like £200,000,000 000, and a large proportion of those millions is held by the general investing public. I rather dissent from the views which have been taken by the Liberal newspapers, in representing the people who have invested their savings in this sort of stock as a rather sinister and peculiar people. Really to read some of these papers you would think that people who hold brewery shares were quite different from the holders of the same sort of stock, we will say in a railway or a dock company, and I rather take exception to the line which is also taken in some of our papers on this side, which is embodied in such a phrase as you often see quoted in Press headings: "The Trade *versus* the Public." To hear some folks talk you would think that a retired colonel or a clergyman or a widow who happened to have invested anything between £500 and £10,000 in a brewery company had themselves become all but not merely publicans and brewers but also sinners. I do not know that there is any good ground for that. A person who invests in a joint stock undertaking is an investor and no more a trader than an investor in consols is a money-lender. Now I think the noble Marquess laid stress on this; that where any particular industry is made the object of legislation Parliament cannot be too tender or too considerate in the way it deals with that industry, so as to enable it to adapt itself with as little pain and dislocation as possible to the new conditions which Parliament directs. I agree. But granting all that from the other side of the question, I also rather dissent from the line taken by your friends that the brewers are a sort of "Babes in the Wood," a sort of children of light who have been walking about the world all these years with their eyes closed and their ears sealed to the various vicissitudes which beset us in a troublesome world. Here, again, I have the greatest liking for brewers. They represent, I think we will all agree, a most attractive form of competence, vouched for by their possession of fine houses and beautiful horses, and rare Sir Joshua Reynoldses and so on. I remember a horse-dealer that I knew saying the people he liked best were the brewers, that he had a most charming and friendly recollection of a bishop, but he said: "Give me the brewers." He preferred them even to Members of your Lordships' House." But here, again, I say that this idea that the brewers are such guileless people, and that they have got into these difficulties with tied-houses through no sort of fault of their own, does seem to be rather ridiculous.

I will tell you again what happened to me, if it does not bore you. Some years ago, about the middle of the great speculation in public-houses, I owned in this very village which I have told you about three or four public-houses. I felt that it was too many for one individual to hold. I am in the enjoyment, as no doubt all your Lordships are, of the services of a most admirable family lawyer, who lives at a place called Clitheroe Castle. He is the last man in the world who would claim any of the prerogatives of a prophet or care for them, but I remember very well that he said to me at that time: "This thing cannot go on; sooner or later you will have one party or other in the State who will knock all this public-house business and all the value of this public-house property to pieces, and, if you take my advice, I advise you to sell them." I took his advice. I had rather forgotten what happened, but I think these figures which I have just received by telegram from my agent are rather remarkable. One of my houses which is called the "White Bull" was assessed at £26, and another one called the "New Inn" was assessed at £38 at the date of the sale, September, 1907. Those two houses made £10,000; there were some farm buildings with both of them, and they were worth something under £1,000. I had another inn let, with 23 acres of land, assessed at £42 10s.; that is let now, on a long lease, again, to the same brewer, for £226 a year. What I say there is that if my lawyer was able to foresee the complications which might arise—he had noticed, I suppose, the Darwin case and the *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield* case, and the letter of the Secretary of the Licensed Victuallers' Association, I think, after the *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield* case, although that is disputed, and it is said that the Secretary only cited his own view—but anyhow my solicitor had noticed these things, and had come to the conclusion that this could not go on; and I should have thought that well-managed breweries would also have been able to foresee it and to protect their own shareholders by making due provision when they bought houses at the kind of price at which I told you they bought these houses of mine.

I think that I have said all I have got to say except this. Perhaps you may think from what I have said just now about the investing public, and my tenderness for the investing public, and my desire, if this Bill had gone to Second Reading, to see the position of the investing public, and in some way the position of licensees, made considerably better—you may think from this that I am entirely with you, but I am not. It is because I believe that a little more tenderness ought to have been exhibited towards the investing public and the licensees, that I say that a good deal of that might have been altered and improved if you had not contracted yourselves out of making suggestions which public opinion would have backed you in. If you had not done that, I think the Government would have done what they could to meet you by improving the time-limit and so on. A good many people think that the time-limit is not enough; I belong to that persuasion. I should have liked to see it twenty-one years or even twenty-eight years. If it could have been made twenty-eight years I believe it would have been better. I do not know whether it would have eased the wheels of this coach; I suppose not, because it is a curious thing that the time-limit seems to raise more angry passions, almost, than anything else, even in the breasts of those for whom it is supposed to have been specially devised. But, anyhow, I believe myself that the Government Bill is a Bill which makes in the right direction for dealing with the various difficulties which surround the drinking problem in this country, and I believe that with a time limit of twenty-five or twenty-eight years it would have given ample time and ample facilities to everybody to make their arrangements and adjust themselves to the new conditions. Therefore, as I have said just now, although I should have liked to have seen many changes in the Bill, I am an out-and-out supporter of the Second Reading of this Bill, and I regret very much the line which I feel certain in all sincerity and seriousness the noble Marquess and those who sit with him have seen fit to take. I dislike altogether any appeal by either side in this House as to what would be popular in the country, or as to whether you are consulting your own interests or otherwise. I give you full credit for your intentions, and I give you full credit for the supposed wisdom of the arguments and the sincerity of the convictions which have led you to take the line you have taken. No doubt it will be a popular line, for nobody seems to like Licensing Bills. I do not think the noble Marquess or his friends would have gone to the country on their 1904 Bill. Therefore, a Bill that is thrown out neck and crop, like this is going to be thrown out to-night, will no doubt receive a great deal of popular acclamation of a certain sort. I am reminded of one thing, perhaps not touching such a big issue, which has come back to my memory. I have not looked it up, but I think I am accurate in saying that when Sir Robert Peel made his final farewell address to his party, when he admitted that he was beaten in the House of Commons on the Corn Laws, he said it was true that he was beaten, but he added that it was possible that his name would be remembered for good in many a poor household. I should like your Lordships to consider, giving you again credit for your sincerity, whether the converse may not be true in this case, and whether, by throwing out this Bill without any attempt to touch it up or to improve it, it may not be the other way on, and that your Lordships may not be remembered for good in many a poor household where the vicissitudes of non-employment and of illness, and of many children to keep, are not made easier by the neighbourhood of a public-house.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON: My Lords, after the charming and amusing and at the same time most effective speech to which we have just listened I am afraid that what I have to say may perhaps seem sad and dull, but I do want to-night, not so much as Bishop of London but as an old temperance worker for thirty years, to recall to your Lordships' minds a few facts which really no one denies. The first is the awful drink bill of this country. I believe that no one for a moment denies these figures—they have been published and I have seen no denial of them—that what is spent on alcoholic liquor in this country per annum is £166,425,000, and that when you work out those figures having regard to the population and to the families in this country, it amounts to no less than 7s. 3d. per week on an average for every family in the country, and that is leaving us benighted teetotallers out of account altogether. Therefore, if the compiler of these figures is right when he says that the expenditure on drink is 7s. 3d. per family per week, can you wonder that that expenditure is accompanied by urgent complaints that the children go without food, and that there is no provision for unemployment or for old age? That fact about the drink bill of our country is not denied. When I was over in Canada last year, and had the chance of speaking to numbers of Canadian men, I remember that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did me the honour to sit by my side, as I thought, to back me up, and not only he himself but all the Canadians were horrified at these figures. Canada in proportion to its population drinks only one-fourth of what the Mother Country does.

Then again, at the Pan-Anglican Congress this year, the American bishops and the Canadian bishops said that on the other side of the Atlantic they never see a woman enter a public-house at all. Therefore, I feel this, that we are really in great danger of shocking those noble sons whom we have sent out into the world, and that our drink bill, which we are ourselves so accustomed to, is considered a disgrace to us by the very sons whom we have sent forth into the world. What is the result of this?

Your Lordships may have seen a little quiet fun poked at me in the papers for what has been called my "midnight march." That midnight march was not undertaken in any connection with the Licensing Bill at all. It was part of an effort which I made as Bishop of London to carry out a mission in central London. But I do not deny that there were humorous sides to that midnight march. When those 200 or 300 men were invited by the Church Army to sing "Lead, Kindly Light" they all insisted on singing "For he's a jolly good fellow," and still more merriment was excited by the efforts to argue away that midnight march; the public-house people—excellent men as I am certain they are, and when we speak of them we must always do justice to them as men who, no doubt, are trying in a difficult position to do their best, certainly as far as we know in London—but it caused certain merriment that they should be asked to state how many drunken men they had on their premises that night, and when the police were asked how many men they had not taken up on their beat that night. The midnight march resulted, without any humour connected with it, in one of the saddest sights I ever saw in my life. Two hundred men—one who was a witness with me said 300; he says that I have underrated it by 100—but at least 200 men under forty, between half-past eleven and half-past twelve on Saturday night, all under the influence of drink and with their young faces seamed with drink. I am certain that if your Lordships had seen that sight it would have gone to your hearts as much as it went to mine, especially when I had the knowledge that if I had had the same organisation, the same band, the same companions with whom I went through that part of Westminster, I could have seen the same sight in every slum of London at half-past eleven or twelve on a Saturday night. In that you have the first result, and in our discussion to-night you must not leave out of sight that awful result of what the drink bill of England means.

Now let me mention another point. Information was brought to me to-day from one of the prison chaplains in one of our prisons in England, and he says that in the prison he has to do with 90 to 93 per cent. of those who are there are there directly or indirectly through drink. I take another point. I had the chief representative of the Church Army down to see me to-day. He says that in their opinion they might close all their labour homes but for drink.

The noble Marquess has spoken of the improvement that has taken place in temperance. Thank God there has been an improvement; thank God our efforts for twenty-five years have not wholly been in vain, but at the same time it is acknowledged on all hands that the increase of drinking among women is appalling, and if we think what the increase of drinking among women means, and its effect upon the coming generation, is it not possible to minimise in some way that awful danger? In certain public-houses I have been told that there are private entrances for women, where they can go in at one door and go out another way, so that women can now go into public-houses more easily than they could before. When I contrast that with what my brethren on the other side of the Atlantic have said, the Mother Country compares very badly with them.

Then with regard to the effect upon children. Some of you may have read a very interesting book, although perhaps somewhat sensationally written, called "The Black Stain," by Mr. George R. Sims. I should have considered that book sensational if I had not lived in the slums and seen myself the sights that he has described, the number of children whose livers have become hardened by gin given them by their parents in public-houses. I would ask why is it that three times the number of children are killed on Saturday nights by their mothers overlaying them? There can be only one answer to that and the answer is because their mothers have been drunk.

Therefore, I put before your Lordships the grossness of the evil, and I ask those of your Lordships who care for the future generation to think what the effect of this is upon the children. It has already been quoted to-day, but it will bear quoting again; the noble

Earl when he introduced the Motion to-night quoted that it was acknowledged by the whole of the Majority Commission that a gigantic evil remained to be remedied, and that hardly any sacrifice would be too great which would result in a diminution of this great national degradation. Therefore, we have a point in our argument as to which everyone agrees that this is a national degradation.

Then comes the question, will legislation do any good? Let me be perfectly frank to-night, my Lords. I do not look to legislation to do the chief good; but while I do not look to legislation to do the chief good, I do say to you, to use a scriptural metaphor, that while we must bring spiritual means and moral means to raise Lazarus, you can by legislation take away the stone which keeps him down. I have looked very carefully to see what I think would be the effect of diminishing the number of public-houses upon the decrease of drunkenness. I have had a great many deputations during the past few months from brewers, and I quite agree with the last speaker that they are most charming men personally. I could not think at first why it was they wanted so much to see me and to seek my acquaintance recently, but I found that it was very often in order to try and impress upon me that I was totally wrong on the Licensing Bill. I had some very interesting conversations with those brewers, and I remember I asked a member of one deputation this very question: "Will the decrease of public-houses add to the profit of the other public-houses?" "No," he said, "the custom, as far as we can ascertain, entirely evaporates." If that is so, then I say the reduction of 30,000 public-houses is a great temperance reform. If, on the other hand, other brewers are right who say that it will add to their profits, then I do not think that the Government can look at it as an unjust thing to ask those who are to have their trade increased to pay something towards the compensation of the others. Therefore, although I am perfectly willing to admit that there are two sides to the question as to how much the closing of public-houses will decrease drunkenness, I think we are not far wrong if we take the evidence of one who ought to know, namely, Mr. James, the President of the Plymouth, Devonport and Stonehouse Wine, Spirit and Beer Trade Protection Society, who, writing in 1885, said as follows—

> "Any person of ordinary intelligence who has been in the trade for a period of twelve months must and does know that the large number of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquor is the principal cause of a considerable portion of the convictions for drunkenness."

And in the same paper, "Temperance Legislation and Licensing Reform," Mr. James declared that—

> "To remedy the evils connected with the consumption of alcoholic liquor a large reduction in the number of licences is absolutely necessary."

And I might ask why if that is not so should the Majority Report have advocated the immediate closing of large numbers of public-houses? When the noble Marquess then states in his Motion that there is very little material advantage to temperance in the Bill I must remind him under that first heading alone what the closing of 30,000 public-houses would mean to us as temperance reformers. But there are many other provisions on the side of temperance in this Bill. Some have been mentioned; some have not. If you had lived for nine years in Bethnal Green, as I have done, you would know the sights you see in and about public-houses on a Sunday. It is a thing that is very disheartening when you see, in spite of all your efforts by lectures, sermons, and mission services every public-house crammed with struggling masses of humanity hour after hour on Sundays. I was very much disappointed at first when I found in the Bill that my diocese was left out with regard to Sunday closing, but I was glad to find afterwards that London, if your Lordships do not throw the Bill out, is to enjoy the reduction to three hours of Sunday opening. Then again, I think the closing of publichouses on polling days is an excellent thing, and also that the closing of them before eight o'clock in the morning is an excellent thing. What are we told by those who have seen it—I do not pretend to have seen it myself—but I am told that at six o'clock every morning in public-houses you will see rows and rows of mugs of spirits waiting for men to go in and drink to start their day's work on. As I say, I have not seen it myself at six o'clock in the morning in London, but I know it is so in the north, and that is one of the great temptations that would be swept away by this Bill. Then again the *bona fide* traveller has to walk six miles before he can obtain drink. We are glad of that. We are glad that the discretion of the magistrates is brought in again, and although, as I shall say in a moment, I do not think the Bill has been strong enough on clubs, I do hold that it has been unjustly criticised in that regard, because the annual registration of clubs is a great thing, and the other restrictions on clubs seem to me not to be despised at all. Then we are glad above all to see the power that is given to the magistrates to exclude children from public-houses. That is a thing that every child lover ought to be glad to see in a Bill.

No doubt there are certain defects in the Bill; I have always said so, but those were just the defects that we were looking to your Lordships' House to help us to get rid of. Personally, I should have advocated, I confess, a stronger treatment of clubs. There is one simple thing that might have been introduced, and that is the publication of club-accounts in order that we might see whether they were in fact mere drinking-clubs, clubs of the character, to use the noble Marquess's language, where a halfpenny worth of bread and a great amount of sack was consumed. I should have liked to have seen, by a disclosure of the accounts, which were the real clubs, and which were mere drinking-clubs. Then, again, personally I should have been glad to have dealt with the off-licences in a stronger way. I cannot agree, I am sorry to say, with the noble Earl when he said that they did little to encourage secret drinking. The evidence that I have goes to show that these off-licences are a mischievous thing which must be dealt with in some way by Parliament. So again I should have very much liked to have seen in the Bill some restriction as to the hours of closing on Saturday nights. Why should public-houses be open till twelve o'clock? I was hoping that your Lordships would try and amend this Bill, and there is no reason why we should not have sent it down to the House of Commons again a stronger and a better Bill.

But it is said the Bill is wholly unjust. Now I am perfectly ready to admit that I have always been myself very soft-hearted about the length of the time-limit. I had a conversation with a brewer who was a member of one of the deputations that came to see me as to the length of the time-limit, and I asked him, "What would you like. How will twenty-eight years suit you?" He said, "Twenty-eight years I would not mind." He was the head of a large brewery, and I thought that as he seemed to take twenty-eight so quietly it would not be far wrong to say that twenty-one would be about just. But personally if your Lordships had fixed any longer time-limit as fair I should never for a moment as a temperance reformer have objected. It seems to me not beyond the wit of man to fix the value of what is admittedly not a freehold and yet which by everybody's admission is a reasonable expectation, and that it is a thing that we might have done and done most usefully for the country. But, of course, what it comes to is this, that if this Bill is rejected on the Second Reading licensed property becomes practically a freehold.

Then again I would deal for a moment with what the previous speaker, the noble Lord who preceded me, said with regard to the knowledge of the trade. Mr. Thomas Nash's statement years ago has been often quoted—

> "There cannot be the smallest doubt that in the strict sense no such thing as a vested interest exists, and that subject to appeal the magistrates can refuse to renew the largest, most useful, and best-conducted hotel in England. I daresay that this will stagger many owners, but it is high time that the trade fully realised their position, and did not remain an instant in a state of false security."

Much more recently, and much more forcibly—I am quoting from the Blue-book of the Trade of 1903—mutual insurance is advocated as follows—

> "The idea was a great one and, like most great ideas, was simple. Capital was invested in a defective security; the property which depends for its value on a licence. The defect, judged by past experience, was not a very serious one; but there it was; licences, by legal and judicial

methods might be destroyed. The exigencies of a brewer's business compelled the investment in licensed property, and the force of competition practically drove the whole of the capital into such business. With all their eggs in one basket, and that radically defective, what more necessary than a sound scheme for remedying the defects."

It seems to me while we are most anxious—I am certain I am—to do full justice to the trade, and full justice to every man, we are deluding ourselves if we think that the trade were so simple as not to know the facts of the case all the way round.

I have just two more points and I have done. It is said that the Licensing Bill has really been the cause of the ruin of many honourable firms, but do let me recall to your Lordships' attention the perfectly cold and critical article that appeared in *The Times* Financial Supplement of 6th March, 1908. It is contained in this statement called "The Truth about the Brewery Market." It says—

> "The Licensing Bill whatever it may threaten has not killed the brewery market; the market was dead before, and dead as the result of the speculation by brewers in tied houses, which culminated ten years ago, and has been collapsing year by year ever since."

It seems to me that we have no right to lay on the Government the unjust accusation that they have killed some of the firms which were themselves killed before the Licensing Bill came in at all, and, therefore, I feel that a most unjust opprobrium has been cast on the Government for effects attributed to the Bill which effects are due to other causes.

The other point relates to the argument that the 1904 Act was working very well. Let me acknowledge, if I may in all honesty, that it has worked better than I expected when I spoke about it in this place in 1904. But the fact remains that it is working more slowly every day, and that as the cost gets greater for the public-houses it will work slower and slower, and if it was good to shut up any public-house at all, surely to expedite the closing of them is good also, but at the rate your 1904 Act is working I honestly believe that we shall not shut up 30,000 houses in 100 years.

The Lord Bishop of London.

Therefore it is that I come round to what I am going to ask your Lordships' to do, with all fairness to all concerned, and that is—although I am afraid it is perfectly hopeless—to reconsider the decision to which you seem to have come. I do not ask you to pass this Bill as it stands, I would myself try and help to amend it in many ways, but I ask you not to reject the Bill altogether, because I say if you do never will you find a Government that will take up this question again in our lifetime. Reject this Bill and a licence becomes a freehold; reject this Bill and the trade becomes impregnable; reject this Bill and the national degradation, which this measure was designed to cure, will go on unmitigated so far as legislative enactment is concerned for many years to come; but pass it, amend it, and put it on the Statute-book, and you will take a step towards the well being and the happiness of the nation.

*LORD LAMINGTON: My Lords, I must say that I felt some regret when I understood that this Bill was not to be read a second time, but after having listened to the speeches that have been made this evening in favour of that Second Reading my regret is very considerably diminished. First of all, the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading did not indicate that he would be prepared to accept Amedments of any vital character, and also the noble Lord, the Marquess who leads this side of the House, is so emphatic and clear in his statement as to the importance he placed upon doing everything that was possible to increase temperance in this country, that I think my hostility to not having a Second Reading of this Bill is very considerably reduced. At the same time I do not agree with the noble Lord, Lord Ribblesdale, who has said that the decision will be a popular one. From all I have been able to gather in these recent days of the opinions of men of moderate views there seems to be a great concensus of opinion gradually gaining ground in the country that something further needs to be done to check, if possible, the drink evil, and I think, as Lord Lansdowne very properly remarked, there are a number of people who do not understand the details of the Bill, and do not see the injustice which under the circumstances may be done in certain quarters, and they will only blame this House for having summarily disposed of the Second Reading if, as prefigured, this Bill is then rejected. At the same time it must be recognised in the past that by the Act of 1904 we showed very clearly that we were as anxious as any other part of the community to secure legislation that would have possibly reduced the drink evil, and if we do not see our way to accept this measure it is because we do believe that you may not do evil in order that good may come, and it is unfair to accept any proposals which will undoubtedly cause ruin, or at all events, great loss of property to a number of people. The right rev. Bishop of London read out a quotation I think from the Licensing Report in which it said that no sacrifice would be too great to remove this national degradation. But I ask, where is the sacrifice that is made in this case? The sacrifice is not made on the part of the Government; it is certainly not made on the part of the nation. The sacrifice is to come entirely out of the pockets of those who have been engaged in a trade that has been recognised as a perfectly legitimate one up to the present time. The noble Earl, Lord Crewe, tried to draw an analogy between this Bill and legislation such as has been undertaken for the protection of children, but in all such legislation parents are not arbitrarily deprived of their children; all that legislation does is to take children away from bad or improper treatment, but this is a proposal to take away from a man that which he has not been shown to abuse. Again he drew the illustrations of the Act dealing with betting in the streets, as showing that we did not sympathise with the bookmakers. But that was not a case where the bookmakers had invested their capital on the faith of holding what is a Government or a State licence, and in the expectation of having that licence renewed from year to year. Therefore, I maintain that there is not any true or real analogy to be drawn from those instances that were put before us by the noble Lord.

There was one portion of the Bill that I certainly had a dislike to, and that is to any tribunal being appointed *ad hoc.* It is the fashion of the party opposite to introduce such instances of bureaucratic government, and in this particular case, as the noble Marquess pointed out, the new body would supersede those who had local knowledge and experience.

It has been denied that there has been any increase in the number of clubs where the number of public-houses has been reduced. Perhaps the increase has not been so large as might have been expected, but I certainly do not think it can be safely assumed that when you have a Bill of this character which is arbitrarily going to reduce the number of houses and perhaps without proper cognizance of the requirements of the district, that then there will not be a demand or there will not be an occasion for drinking clubs to be created. No doubt the licensing authorities under the provisions of the Act of 1904 would determine the houses or draw up a scheme of the houses that should be suppressed, and, therefore, it might be supposed that they would take into calculation where those houses were least wanted, so that in that case there would be less occasion for clubs to be established. But when you come to an arbitrary reduction, as contemplated under this Bill, I think it can hardly be expected that there would not be any cases where houses would be removed where a demand existed in the neighbourhood for some facilities of drinking and had to be provided for, and consequently clubs would be established. The noble Lord, Lord Ribblesdale, said that he had no sympathy with tied houses. I think I rather agree with him, although I am not in the fortunate position that he was, he having had a clever agent who foresaw the possible legislation that was forthcoming, and thereby got rid at a very good price of those houses that were belonging to the noble Lord. But I do quite hold that those brewers who have spent large sums of money in tying up houses for the sake of disposing of their wares, have embarked in a speculation with which we can hardly feel sympathy if they suffer loss in consequence of any legislative action. But it is not only the brewers but also those who have invested money

Bill was a very inconsistent Bill, and he gave instances of it. He said: "What do the supporters of this Bill do? They say, first of all that getting rid of licences is going to promote temperance." I take it that that is common ground to a certain extent, at any rate, to both parties. He says: "The promoters of this Bill say that if you lessen the number of licences, you are going to lessen the amount of excessive drinking" and he went on to say: "The same people who use that argument say to the brewers that by doing away with a certain number of licences they are going to get, on the other hand, some compensation because they will get additional profit from the surviving houses." You must admit that there is nothing inconsistent in that. Both propositions may be absolutely and entirely true. Let us take the case of three public-houses near together in a town. Supposing this Bill were passed and one of those houses were done away with. Supposing, owing to the doing away of that public-house, 20, 30, or 50 per cent. of its customers stopped going to public-houses at all, that would be promoting temperance; but supposing the rest of the customers went into the two surviving houses, in those houses there would be additional business, but that additional business would be done without any additional expenditure. There would not be the upkeep and the salaries of the house that had been done away with, and it would be quite possible for the owners of those houses to make more profit with the customers they had before and half the customers of the third house that had been done away with. It might be quite possible indeed to have less drinking and more profit, so that the position, therefore, is not an inconsistent one for a temperance reformer to take up. The noble Marquess then went on to say that clubs were too lightly treated by the Bill as compared with the way licensed premises proper were handled. I should like to remind you that in the House of Commons the Government were in this position—that the supporters of the noble Marquess in that House raised a great outcry at the way clubs were being interfered with. They said they were being most drastically treated, and it was an interference which no working man ought to put up with. That argument was used *ad nauseam*. The position of the Government, therefore, was rather difficult. I do not remember the exact figure the noble Marquess quoted, but I think he mentioned a club at which the drink bill came to £2,600, the bill for newspapers to 10s. 6d., and I think the bread bill was 3s. 9d.—those were roughly the figures—and he said that under this Bill it was contended we were going to do away with clubs which are drinking clubs or mainly drinking clubs; he asked who was going to determine which is a drinking club and which is not a drinking club, and he contended that, therefore, it would not be doing away with the drinking clubs. But I would point out that that will depend on the magistrates, and will it not depend also on the number of members that the club has? Supposing a club has 2,600 members and the drink bill is £1 a head a year, it would be perfectly obvious that that club was not a drinking club. But supposing a club had twenty-six members and the drink bill was £2,600 a year—that would be £100 a year a head—it would be pretty certain that that club was a drinking club; and I venture to suggest that that is a thing that any bench of magistrates could decide for themselves as the case might arise.

Then the noble Marquess went on to deal with various other objections to the Bill. He said that off-licences ought to have been interfered with; that the scale of reduction under the Bill was of too cast-iron a nature, that it ought to have had more elasticity, and he wanted a better definition of "monopoly value" than the Bill gives. But surely that is not a reason for rejecting the Bill altogether? Those are all matters that could have been rejected, amended, or adopted in Committee, and they cannot reasonably be given as grounds for throwing out a Bill of this magnitude on the Second Reading.

The next reason the noble Marquess gave for objecting to the Bill was a still more serious one. He did not like the licensing tribunal and its constitution, and said that under this Bill what we were likely to get was a political tribunal. That raised a cheer; I do not know why. I do not know all the members of that tribunal—we have the names before us—but I do know the chairman, and his views are the same as the views of the noble Marquess opposite. The second member I am told is a Conservative; the third member I do not know; but, considering that two out of the three, at any rate, nominated by the Liberal Government, hold the same political views as the noble Marquess opposite, I consider that that sneer against the Government might have been spared us.

Then the noble Marquess went on to the objection that this Bill was a Bill of confiscation. He said that for many years past the Exchequer have been valuing licences for the purpose of death duties, that a very high value has been put upon them, and that it is a monstrous thing that property should be valued for one purpose one day and for another purpose on a different scale another day. He said the idea of fluctuating values—that was his expression—was a wrong one. But all values fluctuate, and I venture to think there is some confusion of mind on this subject. After all, property for death duties is taxed on value; but on what value? On its market value, which is an absolutely and entirely distinct thing from its intrinsic value. If the property to be valued is in the shape of shares, you can get the value of that property by applying to the Stock Exchange, or, if it is a picture or a licence, what the Government has to find out is what similar property is selling for at the time. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has nothing to do with its intrinsic value, of which he cannot form an opinion. What he has to do with is its market value. Take a case, which I venture to say is absolutely on all fours with the valuation of licences for the purposes of death-duties. A man dies and leaves property in a holding in a particular gold mine. The shares are £1 shares quoted at £10 apiece in the market, although perhaps intrinsically they are not worth £1. Three months later they may be down to 10s. a share, but if on the day these death duties are paid the shares stand at £10, the property must be taxed at the price of those shares—£10 a share. It is market value and not intrinsic value that you must take for that purpose—there is nothing else that you can get at; and it is the same thing with the Licensing Bill. The noble Marquess went on to say that one of the great reasons why he had been induced to recommend the rejection of this Bill on Second Reading instead of the considering of it in Committee was this. He said that it was a question of the privilege of the Commons, and that we had had an experience in this House only last summer of the difficulty of amending big Bills while the Government—"the Government" was the expression he used—were pressing Parliamentary privilege to such extremes. I do not think that the noble Marquess, if I remember aright, was ever in the House of Commons; if he had been, it would have occurred to his mind that it is not the Government who decide what is or what is not privileged in Parliament, it is the Speaker. The Speaker determines what is and what is not privileged; the Speaker lays it down in the House of Commons, and it is really the Speaker whom you have to deal with here and not the Government at all.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am very sorry to interrupt the noble Lord, but surely, when the Speaker decides what is privileged and what is not privileged, it is for the Government to decide whether it will press privilege or whether it will waive privilege.

LORD ST. DAVID'S: My Lords, no doubt it is true that the Government may waive the privilege of the House of Commons, but it is the Speaker, and not the Government, who determines what the privilege is.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I did not complain of the Speaker; I complained of His Majesty's Government.

LORD ST. DAVID'S: Then, my Lords, the noble Marquess went on to talk of confiscation. In another place "robbery" was the word that was used, but the noble Marquess' idea is that the real objection to this Bill is that it is confiscation. I was sorry that the noble Marquess did not go just a little further and tell us just why, in his mind, a licence stood in the form of property. I gather from his public work that he does not put it as high as freehold property, because he was a party to the Act of 1904, under which a licence-holder when he gets compensation is to be compensated out of his own pocket. It is perfectly obvious, if a man has freehold land, that you could not take away his land and compensate him out of a special tax put upon land. But when the Government admitted, as they did in 1904, that a licence can be taken away from the owner and compensated for by a special levy put upon licensed property, that, at any rate shows that the party opposite do not regard licences as on all fours with freehold property. But I think that in opposing this Bill they might at least have told us where they class this property, and how many years time-limit they would have thought was enough. It seems to me that it is the one thing that might have been done to settle this question if the noble Marquess opposite, instead of taking the line he did, had stated how many years time he thought would have given sufficient compensation for licensed property. I repeat it seems to me that that is the line on which this question might have been finally dealt with.

After all, what is the position that the opponents of this Bill are taking up? Are they taking up the position that because a man has built up a business under Act of Parliament, and because the Parliament of the time takes a different view of the legislation under which that business has been built up, then that man must be compensated in equity? That is what we should like to know, because, if so, this would be applicable in many other cases. Let me take this illustration: Suppose the views of the noble Lords opposite prevail, and that some years hence we have a protective tariff in this country; a man in a few years time with the help of that tariff builds up a great business where, by his actual capital and skill, he is making £10,000 a year, but where, from the benefit he gets from the protective tariff, he is, as a matter of fact, making £40,000 a year; then suppose that the protective legislation under which he works is rescinded, is that man to be compensated then because his profits have gone down from £40,000 a year to £10,000 a year? You may say, "Certainly not; that is not on all fours with this case." No; but suppose that man had been a clever man, as the brewers were, and that instead of sticking to his property himself he had sold it to a limited company; suppose he had sold his property in shares to widows and orphans all over the country—they are the favourite people—and then somebody proposed that that protective law should be abolished, what should we be told then? Here is a man making £40,000 a year in a business under the sacred protection of an Act of Parliament—are you going to tell us then, that, because the Act of Parliament is altered, the public are going to compensate that man for the business he has built up? I submit that that case is on all fours with the proposal to compensate publicans.

There is another illustration that I should like to give as to the different ideas that are held about compensation. Take this case: A man twenty years ago bought two little houses in a London suburb where there was no public-house; he bought No. 1 and he bought No. 3. Somebody else bought No. 2. The owner of No. 2. went to the licensing magistrates and asked for a licence and he got a licence. You know perfectly well what happened the day that man got a licence. His property went up enormously in value, automatically, from the granting of that licence. But what happened to the unfortunate man who bought No. 1 and No. 3? You know what happened there. Even in the poorest districts they do not by choice like to live next door to a public-house. The granting of a licence to No. 2 therefore immediately automatically lessened the value of No. 1 and No. 3. It immediately lessened their selling value and it immediately lessened their letting value. What happens? For twenty years the owner of No. 2 has had the great pecuniary benefit of that licence, whereas the owner of No. 1 and No. 3 has suffered; and now it is proposed to compensate No. 2 because you take away from him an excessive advantage which he has enjoyed for twenty years, an advantage which has injured the owner of No. 1 and No. 3. You are to give him compensation. And we are proposing in this Bill to give him compensation. Now I want to put this to the noble Lords opposite. They are going to throw out this Bill because, as they say, it is a confiscation Bill. But I want them just to consider this and to put this case to themselves. Take a landlord in Great Britain—there is not such a one, but take for example a landlord who has had a landed property or a building property or a mining property, I do not care which it is, for twenty years, and he has let it not on lease, but year by year, to a tenant at a rental which is only one-fifth of its value; he has let it change from one tenant to another year by year and each tenant in succession has held it and paid one-fifth of the rental value for it; at the end of twenty years the landlord thinks he has done enough for his tenants and that he would like to charge the full rent, the five-fifths which he might have charged any year; if he charged it at once would he be a robber? Would it be confiscation? Can you say that it would? But suppose he went to his then tenant and said: "You and the tenants for twenty years before you have enjoyed this property for £100 a year when it was worth £500 a year; I am going to alter my arrangements; I am going to take the property into my own hands; I do not want to sell it, but I will tell you what I will do—I will let you have the property for fourteen years longer at the same rent that you have been paying for the last twenty years; I will let you have the property for fourteen years longer at one-fifth of its rental value"—I ask you whether there is any one of your Lordships in private life who would say that man had not been generous beyond any man living? That is the position that is taken by the Government, on behalf of the taxpayers of the country. I would ask you to remember this; the Government of the day in these times is not very rich, yet in the short time that I have been in this House we certainly have not been advocating economy to any marked degree on either side. Last summer we had the Old-Age Pensions Bill, the expenditure under which noble Lords opposite, I am bound to admit, tried to cut down in many respects, but that Old-Age Pension Scheme is going to lead to much more expenditure next year and the year after. That, at any rate, is common ground, and for that, no doubt, this side of the House is responsible. But what did we have the night before last? We had the noble Field-Marshal on the cross benches proposing an expenditure on the Army. The noble Lords cheered that and they voted for it by a great majority. Nobody, I think, disputed the figures, I do not think any body discussed the figures; but, as far as I could hear them, the noble Earl the Lord Privy Seal estimated that if that proposal was carried into law it would cost the country something like £20,000,000 a year additional in public expenditure. And then we had another proposal yesterday for spending a large sum additional on the Navy, a proposal, which, I presume, is necessary and will, no doubt, be carried out in due time. You have all these things, you have admittedly a great expenditure going on for old-age pensions, you have expenditure going on for the Navy, and you have that enormous expenditure estimated at £20,000,000 a year on the Army advocated by noble Lords opposite. I put this to you, that this monopoly value of licenses as distinguished from other values is a thing which the nation has a right to resume at the end of any twelve months; and I put it to you, my Lords, that we are treating the existing license-holders fairly when we suggest a time limit of fourteen years. I think this proposal of fourteen years is fair and generous, and I say, if we treat the licence-holders fairly, is it not wise for us to consider whether we should not support the Government rather than condemn it in its proposal to take back for the good of the State this enormous value of licenses, this value which ought not to belong to one class as it does to-day, but ought to belong to the community. I say that in trying to regain it the Government are doing good service to the State.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: My Lords, I propose to take only a small part in the debate in your Lordships' House to-night. The Bill which is now under your Lordships' consideration and which has recently been presented to your Lordships' House by the Government is one which it is claimed has for its object a great humanising influence and a great philanthropic aim, but I venture to think that those who advocate these claims will find that they have not been fully appreciated in the country before whose good judgment they have presented them. My Lords, we who sit on this side of the House must at the outset of these arguments reject the claim of those extremists who set themselves up as the sole champions of virtue. We who oppose this Bill also claim that we are second to none in advocating the cause of temperance. We deprecate most highly the abnormal and the excessive use of alcohol. With every respect to the noble Lords who sit on the opposite side of the House, I would ask them, is there not a political intemperance as well as the intemperance of beer and alcohol? I venture to think that this Bill furnishes a very good example of that political intemperance to which I have alluded. This Bill attempts to remove a state of things which it has been alleged exists, and it claims by removing it to lift the working classes in this country out of a state of insobriety and moral abandonment. From our point of view, the Bill would, I think, commit a very great and grievous injustice upon the vast majority of His Majesty's subjects in this country. We have to look at two things. We have to agree as to whether the promoters of this measure have made out their case as to the vast amount of drunkenness which they allege exists in the country. I venture to say, and without much fear of contradiction, that the drunkenness which exists to-day is very much smaller than existed twenty years ago. I believe that other causes, even excluding the Licensing Act of 1904, have been at work to check the spread of drunkenness. What are these causes? They are the ameliorated conditions under which the working classes of this country live, the growth of education, and the better understood hygiene of daily life. I believe that we who sit on this side of the House are all of us fully convinced that it is only by such measures as increase the education of this country, as increase the comfort of the working classes, and make their lives more tolerable—it is only by such schemes and not by a wholesale scheme of injustice such as this measure works that we are going to make the nation more sober than it is at present. In medical science I believe it is generally customary to seek the cause of the disease before you prescribe the remedy. I believe also that there is a growing belief in medical science that the surgeon's knife will not play as important a part in curing as it did some years ago; new systems have been discovered, serum, inoculation, and so on; but from the measure which is before your Lordship's House to-night I am rather inclined to believe that His Majesty's Government, and those in the country who support them are still firm believers in the antiquated process of bleeding for every possible ailment.

I do not know whether I should be right in saying so, but I am inclined to believe that there are many in this country who have been minded to give their support to the Licensing Bill, and who have given their support to it, in the firm hope that it will never pass. This measure inflicts a great injustice upon the law-abiding citizens of this country. I do not want to touch so much on the question of property, although I shall allude in one moment to that question, because the more the question of property is kept out of the discussion, I think the sooner we shall be able to arrive at the justice or the injustice of this measure. The greatest blot in the Bill to my mind is that it interferes with the individual liberty and comfort of those who dwell, and more especially of those who dwell, in rural districts. It also infers that the public-house is a cause of drunkenness, instead of which, as I intended to make clear at the beginning of my few remarks, the public-house is not a cause of drunkenness, but may be the means of alleviating sorrow and misery which could be alleviated in a more wholesome and satisfactory manner. But there is more than that. It is a working-class pleasure. Supposing we take what is proposed to happen under the Bill: you might only find, as I believe was stated to-night, public-houses within a radius of some seven odd miles. I think it is hardly fair that you should, if I may say so, depopulate the country districts in that way, and make life in the country perhaps more lonely than it is apt to be even at the present moment. The public-house means a great deal to the working man; it means a place where he can go and see his friends; perhaps it is the only club for many miles round, the only place where he can go and discuss the local gossip and the prices of the adjoining markets; where he can discuss politics, and even where perhaps he can draw conclusions from the results of bye-elections.

There is another great blot on this Bill—this Bill of reaction. Legislation must be always contemporary and in sympathy with the prevailing public opinion; it must not be ahead of it, and it must not be behind it, and had His Majesty's Government asked your Lordships to consider this measure twenty years ago it would have been very much harder to have opposed it on the ground that drunkenness did not exist to the same degree as it was stated, than it is to oppose it to-day.

Now I will take one other point, a point on which I think all must agree. Supposing we admit that licences have been issued without sufficient discrimination in the past, supposing we admit that there are too many public-houses at present, two wrong acts never make one right, and consequently, as has been said by a Member in another place, if the State has granted licences, perhaps too easily, it must be very careful in taking them back to see that the minimum amount of unfairness is inflicted on those who have invested their money and perhaps their all in a licensed house.

I have nearly finished, but there are just two points on the legal side to which I should like to allude. We have heard a good deal about the freehold of a licence, but as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack will himself tell us, there is property which is property in every sense of the word, although it is not real property, and although it is not freehold property. For instance, leasehold property is property. I believe that you cannot even call capital freehold property in any sense of the word, or your gold watches, but they are none the less your property. So let us leave this bugbear of freehold property for the moment and realise that it is property that is being attacked, and see that that security which all of us have reason to expect, living under a civilised and highly organised Government, be not removed from us and then the more happy this nation shall be.

I believe noble Lords on this side of the House will agree with me when I say that we would have welcomed most cordially a measure inflicting heavy penalties upon those who sell anything other than the purest beer and the purest spirits. Had His Majesty's Government introduced a measure to this House with the avowed intention of securing temperance by prohibiting the sale of anything but the best beer and the best spirits—for I believe it is the sale of bad beer and bad spirits that has given public-houses such a bad name, and with some justice throughout the length and breadth of this country—the existing Acts not being sufficient or at all events not having had the desired effect—I believe the noble Marquess on this side of the House and those with him would to a man have gone into the same lobby with the Members of His Majesty's Government. But the Government have not done that; they have thought fit to introduce a measure which is unfair and at the same time inefficient, and we oppose it not upon temperance grounds but because it fails to bring about the temperance reform which its promoters allege it will bring about. Therefore I feel quite sure, as your Lordships seem to have already foreseen, that this Bill will be sent back from whence it came, and I believe that we shall earn the gratitude of the whole country, and that although possibly we may earn also the indignation of those extremists of whom I have spoken, yet the credit of your Lordships' House will be immeasurably raised in the opinion of the electors of this country.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: My Lords, all of us, I am sure, desire to consider favourably any measure which has for its object the promotion of temperance. It is alleged in many quarters by persons whose opinion I speak of with respect that this measure is likely to bring about a kind of temperance millennium. I am afraid that this is an uninstructed view which has been expressed without sufficient consideration of the provisions of the Bill. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London drew a painful, and, I fear, too true picture of the evils arising from excessive indulgence in drink among all classes in the great diocese over which he presides. The right rev. Prelate told us of ruined homes, of men, women, and children destroyed body and soul by excessive indulgence in drink, and of vice and crime having their roots in that great evil. I do not think the right rev. Prelate, in comparing Canada with England, made due allowance for the difference in climate, and in the condition and habits of the population. I fear, however, the picture which the right rev. Prelate drew is to a certain extent true; but then he also admitted that he did not look himself to legislation as the main remedy for those evils.

What we have to consider now is the Amendment proposed by my noble friend which is tantamount to the rejection of this Bill. I do not entirely agree with some of the views expressed by my noble friend (Lord Lansdowne), and, therefore, I crave the indulgence of your Lordships, merely saying that I shall endeavour to state my opinions with every respect for the opinions of those from whom I differ. The real question is not whether this Bill should pass into law in its present shape, but whether we can give it a Second Reading with a view to its consideration in Committee, or whether it is so radically bad and so incapable of Amendment here, having regard to the views of the Government and the limited powers of your Lordships' House, that it would be practically useless to consider it in Committee at all.

Well, my Lords, I do not think that many of your Lordships would say that of a good many of the provisions of this Bill. We have heard from the right rev. Prelate and from Lord St. Davids, whom, I think, we may all welcome as a valuable addition to your Lordships House, a good deal as to the clauses in the Bill, which have nothing whatever to do with the reduction of licences. Those clauses form no inconsiderable proportion of this measure. I think they are something like thirty in number. They deal with the subjects of Sunday closing, the exclusion of children from the bars of licensed premises, the power of attaching conditions to renewals of on-licences, and many other reforms of the licensing law which appear to me to be in themselves valuable and useful and to which I do not think there would be any serious opposition in this House. They contain also important provisions of which I cordially approve, with regard to clubs.

Whatever may be the fate of this measure, if the reduction of licences merely proceeds under the Act of 1904, the time will come before long when the further regulation of clubs selling alcohol will be absolutely necessary in the public interest. It is utterly useless, and worse than useless, in the interests of temperance, dealing with on-licences if the next day almost those very premises, or premises immediately adjoining, can be turned into a club, practically a drinking club, where drink can be sold free from the control and supervision to which the public-house is subject. I do not say that these provisions of the Bill are absolutely perfect; some of them are capable of very definite amendment. For example, the clause of which I cordially approve, proposing the closing of licensed houses on the day of election, has been unintentionally extended to public-houses all over the country, though the election may only occur in a single constituency. Then there is a most remarkable clause relating to the providing of meals on Sunday during the hours when premises are closed for the sale of intoxicating liquor, which would lead to the utmost difficulty in the due observance of the law. These are little mistakes which have occurred, and which the Government admit to be due to the closure of free debate in another place. Generally speaking, I must say that I regard these portions of the measure as valuable improvements in the existing law, and I cannot conceive that any number of Members of your Lordships' House would consider that any of them was a sufficient ground for rejecting the Bill on Second Reading. On the contrary, I personally regard them as an important argument in favour of a Second Reading being given to the Bill.

The right rev. Prelate said that if this Bill were rejected on Second Reading a generation, perhaps, might elapse before any Government took up the question of licensing reform again. I would suggest to the right rev. Prelate and to the Government that, supposing this Bill is rejected on Second Reading—and they know perfectly well why it will be rejected—what is to hinder the Government, what is to hinder the right rev. Prelate himself, from bringing in these clauses as a new Bill next week and passing it through your Lordships' House? I have no right to speak for any but myself, though I may probably speak for others when I say that I believe any such action would be welcomed by many on this side of the House. The right rev. Prelate laid great stress on the clause providing for the exclusion of children from public-houses. I think that clause would have been more properly placed in the Children Bill, and I understand that notice has been given to introduce it into that Bill on Third Reading.

I now turn to the real question at issue in this Bill, and that is, of course, the question of the method by which licences are to be reduced. The principle of the reduction of licences is, I think, admitted by both great parties. I know there are some who doubt whether the reduction of licences leads to the promotion of temperance, and there may be certain cases in which it would have no such effect; but I believe, generally speaking, it is admitted by both parties that if by reducing the number of licences where it is excessive in proportion to the needs of the population you diminish the facilities for obtaining drink, you will make a great move in promoting temperance. That, of course, was the object and principle of the Act of 1904, and that I take to be the object and principle of this Bill. My noble friend who moved the Amendment was one of the authors of the Act of 1904. I approved of it and supported it in another place, and I think it would be quite wrong to describe that Act as a failure; but, although, in my belief, it has done great good, consistently with justice, in reducing the number of licences, I do not think its operation in that respect has been as extensive as its authors anticipated. I heard my noble friend to-night state that some 1,500 licences a year had been reduced since its passing. That may be so. I have not the figures, but, if I remember rightly, some 2,000 or 2,500 was stated by responsible Ministers in this House and in another place at the time the Bill of 1904 was under consideration as the probable number which would be reduced under its operation in the course of a year.

LORD **BELPER**: If the noble Viscount is referring to the statement that I made in moving the Second Reading of the Bill in your Lordships' House, I may say that I made no estimate of the number that would probably be reduced by the operation of the Bill. I stated distinctly what the total amount was that would be available for compensation, but I specially stated that I made no estimate with regard to the number to be reduced.

*VISCOUNT **ST. ALDWYN**: I do not think that is quite a contradiction of what I said, because I gathered from the speech of my noble friend near me this evening that 95 per cent. of the sum provided for compensation had been utilised in this way. Therefore nearly the whole of the sum which my noble friend below the gangway anticipated has been used for this purpose. However, the point is not material. All I would say is this, that I think the reduction of licences has not been as great as was anticipated, and that in that respect the Act has not been so successful as I should like to see it.

I should like to consider for a moment why no larger reduction in the number was made. In the first place, the Act gives very considerable power to the licensing committee of Quarter Sessions over the action of licensing justices in any petty sessional division if, in their zeal, they propose the reduction of too many licences; but the Act does not, on the other hand, give Quarter Sessions or the licensing committee any power to move licensing justices to necessary action if the justices for any reason do not act at all. There are too many petty sessional divisions in which licensing justices have not shown that readiness which any unprejudiced person would consider they might have shown to carry out the provisions of the Act of 1904, and so the progress of reduction under that Act has not been such as was hoped for.

The Government propose to remedy this in two ways. In the first place, they propose a maximum scale of licences according to area and population in country parishes and wards of towns. My noble friend has shown the difficulty of carrying out such a scale, and the Government have recognised the difficulty, because they have inserted so many possible modifications of the scale that it cannot have any uniform operation. I think myself the scale is too narrow, it should give a larger number of houses to population. But that is purely a matter for Committee, and I cannot imagine His Majesty's Government would throw any obstacle in the way of a reasonable settlement of this, so I will not refer to it further.

But I do think that the proposal to abolish altogether the licensing Committee of Quarter Sessions and to substitute a central tribunal in London of three paid Commissioners is a very unfortunate proposal. The Liberal party in old days was a great defender of local government and anxious for its extension, and it is a bad omen that during the last two or three years there has been more than one proposal of this kind to take away discretion from local authorities who are known and trusted by the people, and give a power over them to a central board in London. I have every respect for the three gentlemen named, and I am quite sure they would act fairly and impartially in this matter, but they cannot possibly have the local knowledge which is, above all things, essential for an estimate of the number of licences that ought to be abolished.

There is the further difficulty alluded to by my noble friend that, if you have a central tribunal, you must have what the noble Earl opposite described as a national fund for compensation; and so public-houses in one part of the country, where no public-houses require to be abolished, have to pay for the abolition of public-houses in another part of the country with which they have not the slightest connection. The Commissioners would have unlimited power to levy for compensation, and so those unfortunate people in the one part of the country might be taxed to any extent for the benefit of people in another part. The noble Earl, in defending the proposal, spoke of places in which there had been no reduction of licences, and I agree that some kind of initiative might be required in exceptional cases, but I do not think it should come from a central body in London. I am confident that Quarter Sessions aided by the enactment by Parliament of a reasonable maximum scale of the number of licences would be by far the best tribunal to settle matters of this kind.

But I come now to the parts of the Bill which have been the subject of the greatest criticism, and those are the provisions in regard to the amount of compensation and the time-limit. I have had very considerable experience in my own county of the administration of the Act of 1904, and I am not quite satisfied with the working of the present system of compensation. I believe its basis to be right. If you want to do justice to a person whose property or rights you take away for the public good, you can take no other basis but that of market value at the time. But market value has been so interpreted by a learned Judge that in some cases, at any rate, more compensation has been given for the abolition of licences than Parliament ever anticipated when the Act of 1904 was passed. It must be remembered that the licensing justices have selected for abolition those houses which were the smallest and the least useful to the public, the trade of which was so limited that the difference in their value, licensed and unlicensed, was comparatively small. Some of such houses were maintained by their owners not because of the profits they produced, but merely in order to keep competitors out of the district. Suppose one of several houses of this kind, owned by a brewery company in the same district has been selected for abolition. It does not seem to me fair that in such cases the compensation for the abolition of the licence should be on the same scale as in the case of a firm or person who owned but a single house in a particular district and whose whole trade would be gone if the licence were taken away. These are cases where I think that the Kennedy judgment, however accurate it may be in point of law—and I do not for a moment question its legal accuracy—yet has led to insufficient discrimination on the part of compensation authorities between different cases where compensation has to be given. Therefore, I should like to see some Amendment of the Act of 1904 in that respect. But now I come to the proposal of His Majesty's Government. How do the Government propose to reckon the compensation to be given in the case of the abolition of a licence? I am glad to see they propose to compensate the tenant and the manager on better terms than the Act of 1904 provides. But in the case of the owner of licensed premises they propose that the compensation shall be such a sum as will purchase, with interest reckoned at 4 per cent., an immediate annuity for the number of the unexpired years of the reduction period, with three years added, and equal in amount to the annual value of the licence as adopted for the purpose of income-tax under Schedule A.

I would ask your Lordships to have some regard to the equities of this matter. There are a good many people in this country who look upon everybody who manufactures or sells beer or spirits or wine as a person who does an absolutely evil thing, who ought to be extirpated as soon as possible, if that could be done, but who, if he cannot be extirpated, is no more deserving of compensation if his business is taken away from him than a thief would be deserving of compensation if he were prevented from stealing. That, at any rate, is not the view of His Majesty's Government. In this Bill they recognise the lawfulness of this trade. They propose compensation of a kind to those whose premises are deprived of a licence. They recognise the possibility of a continued existence of some 60,000 on-licences fourteen years hence, after the statutory reduction has been effected, and of any number of off-licences, to which, of course, they apply no kind of local option or any other restriction.

The Earl of CREWE: Monopoly value.

*Viscount ST. ALDWYN: Oh, yes, except charging them with monopoly value which they say at present does not exist in their case. Therefore, they do consider that persons engaged in this trade where a licence is taken away deserve compensation. But why do they deserve less compensation than if they were engaged in any other business? What is Schedule A? Schedule A, according to the Act of 1842, is simply the assessment of the rack rent, or the estimated rack rent of the premises to which it refers. It has nothing whatever to do, legally, with the profits of the trade carried on there. The profits of the trade carried on there must be assessed under Schedule D. How can it be contended that an assessment under Schedule A can be fair compensation to the persons who are engaged in trade in the premises from which the licence is taken away, and who therefore, are deprived of that trade? That is a question which was invited by the speech of the noble Earl the Secretary for the Colonies. I want him to show, I challenge any one of his colleagues to show, how it is possible under Schedule A to compensate a man sufficiently for the trade profits of which he is deprived.

I know that His Majesty's Government intend, in this Bill, to have a reassessment of licensed premises to Schedule A. I fancy they are quite right. I believe myself that, owing to the very small rents often paid by the tenants of tied-houses the assessment of public-houses to Schedule A is much lower in the country than it ought to be. But they cannot, I maintain, legally assess the profits of any person, whether a licence holder or the owner of licensed premises, under Schedule A. They admit themselves that they cannot thus assess the profits of the tenant, because they provide compensation for his profits separately. Why will they not give compensation to the owner of the licensed premises for his profits also? That, to my mind, is perhaps the greatest injustice in this Bill.

What would happen if a company existed, just like a brewery company, having many establishments in different parts of the country, in which they carried on a grocery or a drapery trade? Supposing some public authority, or His Majesty's Government, had to take those premises in the public interest? Do they suppose that such a company would be satisfied with compensation for the loss of their business on the basis of their assessment under Schedule A? The thing is absurd. Of course, it may be said, in reply, that that is a totally different thing—the business carried on in licensed premises depends upon the continuance of the licence. Quite true. That might be a reason for reducing the number of years valuation on which you would base compensation for the profits. It is no reason whatever for refusing to the owner of the premises all compensation on the profits which he makes out of them. There is another difference between the position of a company owning a grocery or drapery establishment and a company owning licensed premises, and that is that in the former case the compensation would have to be paid by the authority taking the premises and putting an end to the business. In this case the compensation is paid by the compensation levy on the trade itself. That is perfectly fair. Why? Because before the passing of the Act of 1904 it was the undoubted law that the justices might put an end to a licence, after considering judicially the circumstances of the particular case, if they held that that licence was redundant. Therefore, the Act of 1904 enacted that an insurance fund should be provided by the trade to insure against any such risk out of which compensation should be paid.

This brings me to the question of the time-limit. I cannot understand the principle on which this time-limit is based. Here are people who have undertaken, at the bidding of Parliament, to compensate themselves by an insurance fund for a certain risk. They are only anxious to go on paying to that insurance fund. Why do you tell them that they are to pay for fourteen years only, and that, at the end of fourteen years, their payments are to come to an end? Why cannot you allow them to go on paying for a reasonable time—such a time might possibly be calculated without much difficulty—sufficient to enable their payments to provide a real and sufficient compensation for the extinction of all licences which you, in your judgment, consider redundant? His Majesty's Government will not do that. Their proposal is this—for fourteen years only the owners of licensed premises are to continue to pay to this fund, but in each year that passes their compensation is to become less if their house is abolished, so that the more they pay to the compensation fund during the fourteen years the less they will receive if their house is abolished as redundant, and when the term has expired the licence may be abolished without any compensation at all by the action—which is, I am afraid, not always very reasonable—of licensing justices, or by the action—which may be still more unreasonable—of a parish majority of two-thirds under the system of local option, while they are absolutely deprived of any benefit from the payments they have made to the insurance fund for fourteen years.

I must say that, to my mind, almost the worst thing about this Bill is the introduction of this system of local option. Why cannot you leave it alone? I do not think that local option, in the South of England at any rate, is likely to be put in force at all. In the case of existing licences, you do not mean it to come into force until the end of fourteen years; therefore what is the use of legislating for it now? But you propose to try it in the case of new licences. Perhaps the effect of that may be that you may find yourselves considerably disappointed in the receipt of monopoly value. This idea of monopoly value has nothing whatever to do with temperance. It is a mere process of exacting more money out of the licensed trade. It is, as Lord St. David's told us, just one of those hen-roosts which the Chancellor of the Exchequer desires to rob. What sort of monopoly value do you expect a man to pay for a licence that may be taken away by local option a year after? What sort of expenditure is he expected to make on the premises to which such a licence applies, in providing for the public comfort and accommodation, which my noble friend Lord Lamington desired should be furnished in his Bill and which in my belief would be the greatest antidote to drunkenness in this country; what sort of encouragement has he to make that provision if you leave his licence open to local option? What right have you to subject existing licences to local option? They are licences which the noble Earl says are annual, having only a mere expectation of renewal and always regarded as terminable. But how terminable? Only terminable by law on account of the unfitness of the premises or of the misconduct of the licence-holder, or because the premises are redundant in a particular district. That principle of redundancy never applied at all to the ante-1869 beer-houses until the Act of 1904; and yet the noble Earl speaks of licences being terminable, as if there ever was a time at which, without any reason, they might have been terminated by the will of any bench of magistrates. Is it consistent with common justice that either by the action of the magistrates or by local option, the owners of licensed premises should be deprived at the end of fourteen years of their legal rights in this respect, not merely without compensation, but after themselves paying compensation to rivals where houses have been abolished as redundant, though by the working of your own scheme it will have been shown that the continuance of their own houses is required for the public convenience?

Neither do I understand the proposal with regard to monopoly value. What is it? It is something that is supposed to have accrued since Parliament and the licensing authorities adopted the policy of diminishing the number of existing licences and of declining to grant new ones. That, at any rate, is a matter of somewhat recent years. If it did accrue the proper way to meet it, to my mind, would have been by the increase of the licence duties: but I am not sure that it did accrue, because, on the other hand, it must be remembered that there has been a considerable diminution in the consumption of drink since former days and also that considerable additional taxation has been imposed upon intoxicating liquor. But since the Act of 1904 is there any monopoly value at all which you have a right to extract from existing licence-holders? I contend that they are paying for any monopoly they have obtained by the extinction of licences under that Act in the annual compensation levy, and that to impose a further payment for it even at the end of twenty-one years is an injustice which you have no right to commit. You must, if you want to give any just compensation to the owners of licences—you must fix your term of compensation at something like twenty-eight years. If you were to fix the term on such a basis as that, reverting at the end of it to the law as it stood before 1904, you would no doubt make a proposal which would not be inconsistent with justice both to the holders of licences and the owners of licensed property. But that is by no means the proposal in this Bill. This whole scheme, to my mind, is quite inconsistent with justice to those interested in this kind of property. I do not believe it would ever be accepted by the people of this country as fair or reasonable.

I come to the final point. What is the course to be taken in regard to this Bill? It comes to this House recommended by the votes of a very great majority of the representatives of the people. At the same time, we feel that on the ground of privilege we cannot touch some of its most important provisions. My desire has been, if possible, to go into Committee on this Bill and to amend it in such a drastic way as to meet the objections which I have placed before your lordships. I should have liked very much to have given the House of Commons the opportunity of considering such Amendments, and, in spite of what passed last summer, of waiving their privilege if they thought fit to do so for that purpose.

But what is the position in which we find ourselves? Was there a sentence in the speech of the noble Earl opposite implying that the Government would aid in any such project? The Government have had some little expression of opinion in this House to-night on the part of their own supporters. Lord Ribblesdale is an out-and-out supporter of the Second Reading. He thinks your Lordships ought to revise the Bill. He does not approve of the compensation proposal; he does not approve of local option; he does not approve of the time-limit, and thinks it ought to be extended. He thinks that in calculating any payment for monopoly value a clear preference ought to be given to the old licence-holder. He thinks that tender and considerate treatment should be accorded to an industry whose conditions you are about to change. But I did not observe that those sentiments were cheered by the noble Earl responsible for this Bill, though even the right rev. Prelate took a far more liberal view than the Government have ever hinted at with regard to a time-limit.

I am afraid that from everything they have said, we find ourselves obliged to believe that the Government have nailed their colours to the mast on the questions of time-limit, the compensation basis, local option, and the institution of this tribunal of three Commissioners in London. I do not believe they are able, even if they wished it, to make concessions which would satisfy my mind on these points. If they can do so, I appeal to the noble Earl, not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of many who would like to aid in passing a reasonable Act of licensing reform —if such an Act could be passed consistently with justice to those concerned—to tell us in the course of the debate, not merely that they would consider our Amendments here—we know very well how they were dealt with last summer, even Amendments proposed by Ministers themselves—but would do their best to induce their supporters in the other House to look favourably on these Amendments and waive any question of privilege there. If any such assurance could be given, then I confess for one that I should not like to record my vote against the Second Reading. But if we have no such assurance, then we have no other course open to us but to exercise the constitutional privilege we possess and reject on the Motion for Second Reading a Bill which as it now stands is unjust, and which is undoubtedly unpopular in that part of the United Kingdom which it primarily concerns.

*THE EARL OF CARLISLE: My Lords, I am exceedingly unwilling to take up your time, but, as I am not an habitual supporter of His Majesty's Government, I feel that in giving my vote for the Second Reading of this Bill I am bound to state my reasons for so doing. The Amendment moved by the noble Marquess the head of the Opposition, states that this measure will not materially advance the cause of temperance. It is because I sincerely believe that it will do this that I support the measure. The statement that has been repeated again and again that this is not a temperance measure appears to me, if I may say so with all respect, to be an extraordinary paradox. If the education agreement that has been arrived at were not only approved by the bench of Bishops and the Leaders of the Nonconformist Party, but had also received the assent of my noble friend Lord Halifax, and the heads of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Dean of Canterbury, I think it would be a paradox in that case if the secularist party were to say that this arrangement did not give sufficient security for religious education. That is really the paradox that is put before us now. Every society that is working for temperance in the country supports this Bill, and I venture to say that the support of those who work for temperance is more valuable than that of those who only profess a platonic feeling of admiration for it. There has been often repeated already to-night those parts of the Bill which make for temperance. The reduction of licences was always, before this Bill was introduced, thought a valuable thing for temperance. Not only the Royal Commission, not only both parties in Lord Peel's Commission, but also the late Government looked upon the reduction of licences as a valuable temperance measure. As Lord St. Aldwyn has pointed out, the reduction of licences under the Act of 1904 has not gone on as was hoped and as was promised.

Almost as valuable as the reduction of licences is the restoration of the magisterial authority which this Bill will give. Then there are twenty-five minor temperance measures of which Lord St. Aldwyn spoke. I should like to put this question to the noble Marquess at the head of the Opposition, whether, if this measure was brought in as Lord St. Aldwyn suggested, it would receive his support—whether if that part of this Bill were re-introduced, apart from any of the financial measures, it would receive the support of the Head of the Opposition?

Then I think, when it is stated that this is a hypocritical measure, because there is nothing in the Bill to do away with grocers' licences or to deal with clubs, Members of the Opposition seem to forget how much they did themselves in 1902. The grocers' licences now are under the jurisdiction of magistrates, and they are rapidly decreasing, and would have declined still more had it not been for an unfortunate Amendment which was introduced in your Lordships' House. As to clubs, my belief is that the clauses with respect to clubs are capable of improvement, but it is quite a mistake to say, as has been said, that where one licence is done away with, there a drinking club arises.

The increase of clubs in this country since the year 1902 is partly caused by the Act of that year, requiring the registration of all sorts of clubs, including golf and rowing clubs, and these certainly do not affect the question of private drinking. The curious thing is that in Birmingham and Manchester, where there has been a very great reduction of public-houses in the last two years both in regard to on and off-licences, the number of clubs has not increased, but has actually diminished; and an increase in clubs has occurred in places where there has been no diminution of public-houses. I think it would have been a very useful thing to bring in Amendments strengthening the clauses relating to clubs, but owing to the course it is proposed to take of throwing out this Bill on the Second Reading, that has become no longer possible. We are told that we ought to leave the Act of 1904 to do its work without further interference. The noble Viscount has told us that he considers the Act of 1904 is capable of further Amendment, so that I do not think I need labour that point. What I should like to say is that the objection I have to the Act of 1904—and this objection was much more ably expressed than I can express it by Lord Peel at the time of the introduction of the Bill—is that, practically speaking, it introduced something analogous to the capitulations in the East. This is how Lord Cromer describes the capitulations. The capitulations impair those rights of internal sovereignty which are enjoyed by the rulers and legislatures of most States, and in his last Report from Egypt he said that one of the principal nuisances of those capitulations was that it was now impossible to interfere with the drink houses. By the Act of 1904 you introduced domestic capitulations which prevented you from interfering with this class of property in the way that the rulers and legislatures of most States are accustomed to do.

There is one thing I should like to say, and it is that, although we criticise the Act of 1904, there are two things for which we feel grateful, one is establishing the principle of a regular diminution of licences all over the country, and the other is establishing the idea of the monopoly value. Both the noble Marquess and the noble Viscount who preceded me attacked this principle of the monopoly value, but it appears to me that they did not recollect that this principle has been taken from the Act of 1904, and having been inserted there it is absolutely impossible not to extend it now to all licences, because, unless that is done you will have two different kinds of licences, and you will create the same kind of nuisance that you found in the old beer-houses, namely, one kind of licence which cannot be touched, and regular licence which can be touched by the magistrates. The Act of 1904 did away with that anomaly and made beer-houses subject to the magistrates, but in doing so it created a repetition of the same evil by creating a class of new licences which, having paid the monopoly, could be treated by the licensing authority without any difficulty, and the old licences receiving compensation which you could not touch unless the state of the compensation levy permitted you to do so.

I will not attempt to follow the noble Lord on the financial question. It appears to me that it is really a piece of useless argument to go into that matter at present, because it is impossible to remedy it, as there is to be no Committee stage. We have no evidence whatever that compromises could not have been arrived at upon that subject, but unfortunately the majority of this House has decided that no compromise should be attempted. I regret that very much. It has been stated that property is endangered by this Bill, but my belief is that property is much more likely to be endangered by the course which your Lordships are taking. The Leader of the Opposition in another place told your Lordships that you were as safe as cattle-drivers. I am not quite certain whether that is the case or not, but at all events, the noble Marquess has made use of this cattle drivers argument. He instanced tenant right in Ireland as analogous to the rights of licence-holders, and indeed, the language of many noble Lords in this discussion has reminded me of the old debates in the House of Commons when the Land Bill was coming on. We have all the same phrases about "unwritten contracts," "tacit understandings," "in justice if not in law," and the like. In those debates it was admitted even by those who opposed the Land Bill that the Irish landlords had stretched the ideas of property to an extent that was injudicious. On the other hand they had the written law behind them. They were opposed by those ideas of unwritten contracts and tacit understandings. It seems to me that noble Lords on the Opposition side are now combining the mistakes of both parties. They are stretching the ideas of property to the cracking point, and they are founding that claim not on the letter of the law, but merely on imaginary claims and expectations. I sincerely hope that the result of that action will not be to encourage Socialism more than could be done by 100 Graysons.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL: I think it is just as well that someone on this bench should speak to-night just to show that the Bishops are not all on one side on this question. I am very glad to be allowed this opportunity of showing that I am one of those who cannot take the Government view of this matter. First of all my feeling is that legislation for the future should always be put on such lines that the train does not come to an end with a great jerks; things should be put on such lines that they will move smoothly on. Under this Bill the State train is to be suddenly pulled up and drastic action is to be taken. The Bill is putting the burden of doing, as I think, an unjust thing, upon the people of 1923 and 1930, not upon ourselves; we only say it, they have got to do it. But besides that, as a very keen worker in the cause of temperance myself, and as one whose family and whose whole household, without a single exception, are water drinkers, as one who has devoted as much time as most bishops to working for the temperance cause, I confess to the most bitter disappointment in this Bill, and I cannot regard it as a temperance measure. If those sitting on the Government bench will bring in a temperance Bill I will vote for it and speak for it, but I do not regard the Bill before the House as being in any sense a temperance measure. The details have been spoken about several times. We have heard what the Bishop of London has said. When I was Bishop of Stepney I had some experience of the East End of London. I remember on one occasion seeing a collection of dishevelled looking women, all of them quite sober, and they were looking at a certain place. I asked them what was the matter, and the reply I got was: "If you parsons would pull down that place you would do the best thing for us women that men have ever done for women." The place they pointed at was a drinking club. In one of the towns in my diocese I was told that the great curse of the place was the clubs, and I felt it so strongly that I pressed upon the Government of that time the absolute necessity of dealing very promptly with clubs in any temperance measure, and they did to a certain extent deal with them. Only the other day I had a meeting of rural deans, and one of them said to me: "I have five public-houses in my village, and probably there are three too many; but all the harm done by those five public-houses is nothing like the harm done by the one village drinking club." To deal with clubs in the miserly way in which this Bill proposes to deal with them seems to me to be an outrage upon my sense of what the proper interests of temperance absolutely demand at the hands of your Lordships. I hold in my hand a little pamphlet which has been sent to me this month, and it professes to give an answer to every objection to this Bill. I have looked with very great interest to see what it contains in reference to clubs, and I notice that it says: "the club question is partially dealt with in Part 4 of the Bill, and it may be deemed desirable to omit this portion of the Bill with the idea of treating the subject more fully in a separate Bill upon the Report of the Royal Commission." That is all the comfort I get with regard to the miserably inadequate provisions dealing with clubs.

The noble Earl said that probably we bishops knew more about matters of temperance and intemperance than other Members of your Lordships' House. When I speak to my town clergy on this subject they tell me without the slightest question that the one place we really ought to strike at if we wish to stop the terrible evil of drinking among women—and when I say women, I mean persons of that sex in all classes of life—the one thing which is imperatively necessary is that we should do something of a most drastic character with regard to grocers' licences. I turn again to the pamphlet which professes to give an answer to every possible objection, and I do not find grocers' licences mentioned at all. What am I to say as a strong temperance reformer and advocate of temperance, and as a practicer of total abstinence myself, to a Bill which calls itself a temperance measure and which can have this sort of accusations hurled against it? I do not care how drastic you make a Bill which really makes for temperance. You may say that we should amend the Bill. But we cannot. There is more between us and another place than has been stated. The question of privilege has been sufficiently touched upon, but there is one point which has not been mentioned, and it is that noble Lords in office here and persons in another place with Ministerial responsibility have put such a gulf between us and the other House that it is hopeless to make any really important Amendments in a Government Bill in this House. Therefore I feel that it would be a waste of time to go on with this measure, and I shall be prepared to say in all parts of the country where my voice is heard that the fault of the rejection of this Bill will not lie with the noble Lords geographically opposite, but with those who have raised these questions of dispute between this House and the House of Commons which make it absolutely hopeless for us to amend the Bill in any conceivable way. Just think what it would have been if you had brought in a Bill framed on the sort of lines which the noble Viscount opposite expounded to us. If such a Bill had been presented to this House there would have been no division, it would have run through the House. In every part of the country which my voice can reach, I shall maintain that the rejection of this Bill will not be the fault of noble Lords geographically opposite; it will be the fault of those sitting on the Government Bench.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY: I am not going to make a speech myself, though I regret that this House is not going to undertake the task of considering the details of this Bill, but I desire to move the adjournment of the debate on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Debate adjourned till to-morrow.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 231].

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Eleven o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 25th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

HASTINGS HARBOUR BILL.

Hastings Harbour Bill.—Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

NATAL.

Petition of Francis E. Colenso, for inquiry into the conduct of affairs; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 671 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (MILITARY OPERATIONS).

Address for "Return of Military Operations undertaken by the Government of India on the North-West frontier, the North-East frontier, and beyond India, in the period 1899–1908, inclusive."—(*Mr. Bellairs.*)

EAST INDIA (CUSTOMS REVENUE).

Order [16th June] for an Address for Return relative thereto read, and discharged; and, instead thereof:—

East India (Customs Revenue).—Address for "Return showing the gross amount of import duty collected in British India on articles taxable under the India tariff during the years 1905–6, 1906–7 and 1907–8, together with the percentage of duty realised under each head to the total revenue realised in each year."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Rate of Payment for Casual Labour employed by Post Office during Xmas Pressure.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state what rate per hour was paid last year to casual employees employed specially during the Christmas pressure for both outdoor and indoor work up to 18th December, between 19th December and 21st, and from 22nd December to 26th, at the following offices: Birmingham, Liverpool, Dublin, Belfast, Brighton, Bristol, Cardiff, Hull, Leeds, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Nottingham, Plymouth, Sheffield, Bradford, Cork, Derby, Leicester, Norwich, Swansea, Portsmouth, York, Bath, Birkenhead, Carlisle, Bournemouth, Oxford, Blackpool, Bolton, Cambridge, Cheltenham, Chester, Coventry, Crewe, Darlington, Gloucester, Grimsby, Halifax, Huddersfield, Wolverhampton; and what rate per hour those employed this year will receive for the same dates in accordance with the instruction issued by him.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The desired information could not be procured without a considerable amount of labour. The rates of pay varied according to the district and were in all cases those for which suitable men for the work could be obtained. It seems advisable, as far as possible, to base the rates of pay on a uniform basis, and instructions have therefore been issued that the rates of pay for the temporary force this year should, as far as possible be based on the rates recommended by the Select Committee for auxiliary service. Besides the fixed wage the men receive special pay for night work, for Christmas Day and Boxing Day, and get overtime when it has to be worked. The net result of the alteration will be an increase in the total amount of pay.

Engine Room Artificers—Successful Candidates at Belfast.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that an examination for engine-room artificers Reserve was held in the Custom House, Belfast, during the present year, that seven out of the eleven candidates were successful, that three were called for training and returned on 29th October last, and that the remaining four were informed that they would be called upon to relieve the former three; and whether, in view of the fact that this has not been done, he will state the reasons for the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The hon. Member gives a correct statement of the case in the first part of the Question, except that the remaining four men were not informed that they would be called upon to relieve the former three. The number of candidates who have passed for entry as probationary engine-room artificer, Royal Naval Reserve, is at present in excess of vacancies, and it has not, therefore, yet been possible to enter them all. Passed candidates take their turn for appointment (as vacancies occur) in the order in which they made application for entry.

Irish Department of Agriculture and Home and Cottage Industries.

MR. MULDOON (Wicklow, E.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether the definition given to the words home and cottage industries, in Section 30 of the Act creating the Department, by the Law Officers in Ireland has operated to prevent the Department assisting some cottage industries within the spirit but outside the letter of the Law; and whether he proposes next session to secure an amending Bill to remedy this defect.

(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The second query is under consideration.

Grindleton Churchyard, near Clitheroe.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): To ask the hon. Member for Crewe, as Church Estates Commissioner, whether he is aware that a few years ago a piece of land was purchased for the purpose of enlarging the churchyard attached to the parish church, Grindleton, near Clitheroe, for interment purposes; will he say whether the income from that piece of land has since been included by the Commissioners in the incumbent's stipend; whether it is now proposed to extend the churchyard by adding this piece of land thereto; and, if so, upon what financial and other conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. Tomkinson.*) The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have no information as to any arrangements which were made in reference to the extension of the churchyard at Grindleton stated to have been carried out a few years ago, nor have they any knowledge as to the proposed extension of that churchyard now contemplated.

Small Holding Applications in Surrey.

MR. COWAN (Surrey, Guildford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will obtain from the Surrey County Council particulars of all applications approved by them according to the parishes in which the applicants live, showing name, address, and occupation of applicant, date of application, amount of land applied for, date at which application was approved, and subsequent proceedings; and particulars of all rejected applications, with the reasons for the rejection in each case.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board are not prepared to ask for the Return suggested. It would involve a great deal of labour without any corresponding advantage. Every applicant is informed whether he is approved or not, and the Board are always ready to inquire into any specific complaints. Our experience affords no justification for the suggestion that applicants are as a rule rejected on inadequate grounds.

Classification under the Hobhouse Report.

MR. SILCOCK (Somersetshire, Wells): To ask the Postmaster-General when the sub-offices still in suspense may expect to hear the result of the classification under the Hobhouse Report.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I hope shortly to make an announcement on the subject.

Boycotting in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of cases and of persons boycotted in Ireland on 30th September and 31st October, 1908, in the same form in which the information was given in Parliamentary Paper, No. 89, of last session.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*)

Return of the number of Cases of Boycotting and of Persons boycotted throughout Ireland on 30th September, 1908, and 31st October, 1908—

Date.	Wholly Boycotting.		Partial Boycotting.		Minor Boycotting.		Total number of all cases of Boycotting.	
	Cases.	Persons.	Cases.	Persons.	Cases.	Persons.	Cases.	Persons.
30th September, 1908 - - -	16	75	11	42	196	739	223	856
31st October, 1908	16	75	11	42	193	730	220	847

Valuation of Clyde Foreshore above Greenock.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can say whether any portions of the foreshores on either side of the Clyde above Greenock are entered on the valuation rolls; and, if so, what in each case, is the position and parish, the character, and the annual value for rating.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The following is the information desired by my hon. friend with regard to those portions of the foreshores of the Clyde above Greenock entered on the valuation rolls—

	Parish.	Character.	Annual Value.	
			£	s.
County of Dumbarton	Cardross	Landward portion let to coal merchant	20	0
„ „	„	Seaward portion let to sand merchant	125	0
County of Renfrew	Kirkmalcolm	Timber Ponds	128	17
„ „	„	„ unlet	50	0
„ „	Port Glasgow	„ unlet	11	0
„ „	„	„ let	6	0
„ „	Erskine	„ let	100	0
„ „	„	„ unlet	188	0

Small Holding Applications in Somersetshire.

MR. SILCOCK: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will state the total number of applications that have been made in the county of Somerset for small holdings under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, the number of applicants approved by the county council as suitable, the number of applications which have been satisfied, the number of acres applied for, the number acquired, and the situation of the land acquired.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) 1,844 applications have been made. 1,027 applicants have been approved and 92 of these have already been satisfied. 24,319 acres have been applied for and 779 acres have been acquired. The situation of this land is as follows—

	a.	r.	p.
West Harptree -	79	2	35
Mudford - - -	10	0	0
South Petherton -	19	3	3
Catcott and Edington -	54	0	0
Blagdon - - -	82	2	35
Stoke-sub-Hamdon -	25	2	23
High Ham - -	8	1	33
Henstridge - -	26	2	23
Chew Magna - -	28	3	17
West Coker - -	91	3	16
Keynsham - -	17	3	32
Curry Kevell - -	29	2	22
Ashill - - -	57	3	14
Chilthorne Domer -	42	2	22
Stoke Lane - -	37	0	0
Marston Magna -	89	1	36
*Wedmore - -	77	2	11
	779	3	2

Rejection of Flour supplied to Admiralty.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state what amount of flour has been rejected when supplied by the contractors for use in the Navy to the Royal Clarence, Royal William, and Royal Victoria Victualling Yards during the year 1908; and whether he can state the cause for the rejections.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) A total of 207,330 pounds has been rejected because it was not of the condition or quality stipulated for in the contracts.

Chelsea Unemployed Scheme.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the President of the Local Government Board how many different schemes for the employment of the unemployed have been sent by the borough of Chelsea to the Central Committee, and the amounts of same; how many have been sanctioned; how many refused; and which are under consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Only one scheme has been submitted to the Central (Unemployed) Body on behalf of the borough council, viz., for paving the Royal Hospital Road with wood. The cost of the work is estimated at £2,123, including £467 for labour by the unemployed. The borough council and the central body are in communication with regard to the matter.

Unemployed Men now Working for Metropolitan Borough Councils.

MR. HORNIMAN: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of men employed by each Metropolitan borough council on work sanctioned by the Central (Unemployed) Committee at the present and the estimated number that will be so employed by the middle of December.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that the numbers are as follows—

	At present at work.	Estimated as being employed by middle of December.
Bermondsey - - -	38	38
Hammersmith - - -	20	31
Islington - - - -	22	57
Lambeth - - - -	12	20
Wandsworth - - -	90	92
	182	238

---

* To be acquired compulsorily.

Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief Refunded.

Mr. HORNIMAN: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can now state whether a person who has received Poor Law relief will be eligible for a pension if the same is refunded by himself, a relation, or a friend; whether a man's wife, child, or other relation having received the same will disqualify him; and whether sojourn in a Poor Law infirmary in cases of illness or accident will disqualify.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Three points are raised in the question. I think the answers are as follows: (1) The refunding of the cost of the relief would not remove the disqualification (2) Poor relief given to or on account of a man's wife or child under the age of sixteen will disqualify him. (3) Sojourn in a Poor Law infirmary would usually be covered by paragraph (i.), (ii.), or (iii.) of Section 3 (1) (*a*) of the Act, under which certain forms of relief, such as medical or surgical assistance (including food or comforts) supplied by or on the recommendation of a medical officer, or any such relief as under the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, 1885, does not disqualify a person for being registered or voting, would not disqualify a person for receiving or continuing to receive an old-age pension.

Railway Station for Glenflesk, county Kerry.

Mr. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he can take any steps to induce the Great Southern and Western Railway Company to erect a station at Glenflesk, County Kerry, as requested by the representatives of the farming community of the district, in the interests of agriculture.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) No representations on the subject have been received by the Department. If such representations are made the Department will consider what action they can take in the matter.

Landing of Hay and Straw in Ireland.

Mr. RADFORD (Islington, E.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland have any power to prohibit the landing of hay and straw in Ireland except when coming from a place or area previously declared by the Department to be infected, in accordance with the provisions of the Diseases of Animals Acts; and in exercise of what powers, and in pursuance of what Acts of Parliament, and to what sections of such Acts, were the Orders of the Department numbered respectively ninety, ninety-one, and ninety-two issued.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Acts under which the Orders referred to were issued are specified in the preambles to those Orders, and the Orders were made in pursuance of the powers transferred to the Department by order of the Lord-Lieutenant under Section 2 of the Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899.

Lighting of Lamps at Annalong Harbour, county Down.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state what authority is responsible for the fact that the lamps erected at Annalong Harbour, county Down, are never lighted.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The county council of Down are the harbour authority for Annalong Harbour, and I presume responsible for the lights therein.

Boundaries of the Penrose Estate, Simla.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that the estate of Penrose, Simla, was purchased from the Rana of Koti in 1879, will he explain why Mr. A. Meredith, Deputy Commissioner of Simla, made an order altering the boundary of the estate without giving the Rana the required notice; and, seeing that in 1903 a similar interference in the affairs of a Native State resulted in an order by Mr. Meredith being cancelled after an independent inquiry under the direction of Lord George Hamilton, will he again consider the expediency of ordering a similar independent inquiry in regard to the Penrose estate case.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) No objection, so far as the Secretary of State is aware, was raised by the Rana of Koti at the time of the Deputy Commissioner's order of 1900, but it is still open to the Rana to make any representations he may think fit to the Government of India. The Secretary of State will not be in a position to consider any such representations till they are brought before him in the form of a memorial in accordance with the rules. It is the fact that in 1903, in a case which was hardly similar to the present one, further inquiry was ordered by the Secretary of State in Council on the consideration of a memorial. But, as stated in my reply of the 23rd instant, the Secretary of State in Council saw no reason, on consideration of the memorial submitted to him in the present case, to interfere with the orders passed.

Sale of Non-Residential Grass Lands for Purposes of Enlarging Demesnes.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will furnish a list, by counties, with names of vendor and purchaser and area of land in each case, of the cases during the five years ending 31st October, 1908, in which the Estates Commissioners have sanctioned the sale of non-residential grass land to owners or purchasers of demesnes for the purpose of enlarging the demesnes there being in the same county uneconomic holdings and landless people requiring new holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The monthly Returns of advances under the Irish Land Act, 1903, which are presented to Parliament, give detailed particulars of all lands purchased by owners under Section 3 of the Act, and these particulars are summarised in the tables appended to the Annual Reports of the Estates Commissioners. The preparation of the list asked for by the hon. Member would serve no useful purpose commensurate with the labour involved.

Licensing Reform in Ireland.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is yet in a position to state if it is intended by the Government to introduce any general measure for licensing reform for Ireland in the coming session of Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am unable to add anything to the reply given on my behalf by my right hon. friend the Attorney-General to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member on 22nd October last.

Irish Land Purchase—Redemption of Annuity in Stock.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that so far back as April, 1904, Mr. C. G. Crean, of Ballyhaunis, county Mayo, endeavoured to avail himself of Section 2 of the Land Purchase Act, 1891, to redeem his purchase annuity in stock, but was informed by the Irish Land Commission that he could not do so for want of rules under the section; have any rules yet been made, and can a tenant purchaser redeem his annuity in the beneficial way provided by the section; and can he now have the benefit of the section for payment of one-half of his instalments.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The facts are as stated in the first part of the Question. I understand that no rules have been made under the section referred to, but a tenant purchaser under the earlier Land Acts can redeem his annuity in stock, though not through the Post Office, and for this purpose no rules are necessary. The Answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative. For a full explanation of the matter I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury to a Question asked by the hon. Member for Carlow on 9th July, 1907.

Uncollected Seed Rate at Castlerea.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the amount of seed rate uncollected within the last five years in the union of Castlerea, County Roscommon; how much of this uncollected seed rate was lodged by the county council rate collectors with a view to being paid their full poundage under their warrants; and on what grounds have the Local Government Board refused to permit the refund to these collectors of this uncollected seed rate while sanctioning a refund to the uncollected ordinary rate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The amount of seed rate uncollected in Castlerea Union for the year ended 31st March, 1907, was £47 10s. 5d., the amount for the year ended 31st March last was £112 17s. 1d. There was no seed rate for the previous three years. The collectors lodged the entire amount of their warrants in each of the years named. The Local Government Board have sanctioned refunds to collectors in respect of poor rate legally irrecoverable by reason of vacancies or insolvencies, but, in the absence of satisfactory evidence that the seed rate is in any particular instance irrecoverable by legal process, they are not prepared to authorise a refund in respect of it.

Evicted Tenants—Claim of Mrs. Killen and Mrs. Hobson.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners hold that conditions of vacating a holding submitted to by a widow under threat of eviction, without the consent of her children, are sufficiently valid to deprive the children of the right of reinstatement in their father's farm on the estate being sold, and that farm not tenanted *bona fide*; whether the equitable powers vested in the Commissioners enable them to do substantial justice in such a case; and whether they will reconsider equitably the claims of Mrs. Killen and Mrs. Hobson for reinstatement in the farm formerly held by their father, Bernard Killen, on the Joly estate, at Corbetstown, King's County.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when an estate comprising evicted land is being sold and the claims of the evicted people are, from lapse of time or other cause, technically weak, whether on a sale of the estate the Estate Commissioners will allow those claims to be ousted by the creation of new tenancies in persons not prepared to reside on the land, but purchasing as a speculation with a view to subsequent sale; and whether, in view of the effect of such proceedings in a district containing *bona fide* evicted tenants and congestion to be relieved, the Commissioners will take steps to prevent such a course of action being followed on the Joly estate, in King's County, now in process of sale.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In dealing with applications received from persons seeking reinstatement as evicted tenants or as the representatives of evicted tenants, and in making advances, the Estates Commissioners have due regard to the circumstances of each case and to the provisions of the Land Purchase Acts. The Commissioners are not prepared to reconsider their decision not to take any action in the case of Mrs. Killen or Mrs. Hobson, whose mother surrendered her lease of the farm at Corbetstown in 1883 in consideration of a pension of £50 a year for life.

Action of Mr. W. T. Potts at South Roscommon.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Willie T. Potts holds, in addition to land in Scotland, 2,500 acres of untenanted grassland in South Roscommon, exclusive of his demesne, and is at present using the compulsion of writs, seizures, and threats of eviction to force his tenants in the same county to purchase, at high prices, uneconomic holdings without enlargement or improvement; and, in view of the intentions of Parliament in 1903 and of the present legislative proposals of the Government, whether he proposes to take any steps, in his Land Bill or otherwise, to deal with such cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have no information with respect to the first part of the Question beyond what has recently appeared in the public Press. The Estates Commissioners have more than once addressed letters to Mr. Potts, under the regulations of 13th February, 1906, with a view to ascertaining whether there is untenanted land on his estate suitable for purchase, but have received no replies.

Appointment to Vacant Inspectorship of Irish National Schools.

Mr. J. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland intend to appoint to the vacant inspectorship a practising teacher, instead of filling the position by an outsider who cannot understand the duties owing to want of previous experience.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education cannot at present say who will be appointed to the vacant inspectorship, as they have not yet considered the numerous applications which have been received. Experience of schools and school-keeping will, of course, receive due weight in forming an estimate of the qualifications of each candidate.

Crossgar Labourers Cottage Scheme.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the scheme for the erection of cottages at Crossgar, Dromara, County Down, was passed by the Banbridge Union; and when they are likely to be erected.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The last scheme received by the Local Government Board from the Banbridge rural district was made by the council on 9th March, 1908, and submitted to the Board on 4th May, 1908. The order in respect of the scheme, as unopposed and confirmed on 21st October, provides for the erection of seventy-two cottages, of which three are to be built in the townland of Crossgar. The Board at present await the application of the council for the appointment of an arbitrator to assess the compensation to be paid to the persons interested in the lands about to be acquired.

Irish Land Purchase.

Mr. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the figures he has given as being the average number of years purchase under the Land Act of 1903 in various counties in Ireland refer to rents actually paid or to the rents stated in the purchase agreements; whether he is aware that in tens of thousands of cases of non-judicial and first-term rents voluntary abatements have been obtained by the tenants and the actual rent paid has averaged 20 or 25 per cent. under the rent nominally payable; whether he is aware that the nominal rent, and not the actual rent, is invariably stated in the purchase agreements in such cases; whether, if so, the figures of years purchase for certain counties which contain a larger proportion of such cases would seem more favourable to the tenants than they really are; and whether, in the case of a tenant getting an abatement of 25 per cent. and buying at twenty-two years purchase of his actual rent, it would appear in the Return as if he purchased at sixteen and a half years purchase of the rent stated in his purchase agreement, thereby vitiating the calculation of average price.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The figures given represent the average number of years purchase on the rents legally payable, and could not be calculated on any other basis. The Land Commission are aware that in many cases voluntary abatements, varying according to circumstances, have been allowed.

Police Inspectors in County Galway.

Mr. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of county inspectors, district inspectors of the first class, district inspectors of the second class, and head constables in County Galway, exclusive of extra police; whether he can state separately the cost for the last financial year under the head of salary, allowances for men-servants, forage, lodging, stationery, office fuel and light, mileage, subsistence allowances, and any other charge, for each rank of the above inspectors and head constables; and whether he will state for the same period the number and cost of the rank and file on the quota of the county.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) There are in County Galway at present two county inspectors, four district inspectors of the first class, nine district inspectors of the second class, and fourteen head constables, exclusive of the extra force. The free quota of the county in the year ended 31st March last was composed of 616 sergeants, acting sergeants, and constables. The accounts of the Royal Irish Constabulary Department are not kept in such a form as to admit of the particulars of cost asked for by the hon. Member being given.

Appointment of Unemployed Colonels.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether there is a list of unemployed colonels and brevet-colonels in No. 135 and following columns of the Army List, showing the dates on which officers were placed on half-pay, and have several officers been on half-pay since 1905; whether the majority of colonels' appointments are filled from officers on this list, and, if so, what steps, if any, are taken to ensure that officers when selected are in a fit state of health for their appointment; and whether, after an officer has been placed on half-pay, any examination is made as to his mental or physical fitness, even in the case of officers who were in a bad state of health during their last period of employment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This list is shown in Column 135 and following columns in the Army List, and contains the names of ten officers placed on half-pay in 1905. The majority of colonels' appointments are filled from it, and in most instances it is not considered necessary for the officer to be medically examined. If there was any doubt as to the medical fitness of a colonel on half-pay who was selected for an appointment, he would be required to go before a medical board.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Shipbuilding Delays.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty to what extent have the "Téméraire" at Devonport and the "Superb" at Elswick been delayed by the engineering strike, and when are they likely to be commissioned; and, if the Admiralty cannot give assurances that such delays will not occur in future, can ships of future programmes be laid down earlier to meet the probability of such delays.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The "Téméraire." will be delayed six months, and the date for complete commissioning will probably be June, 1909. The contract date for delivery of "Superb" is 4th January next, which date, in view of delays caused by labour troubles, will be exceeded. The question of the amount by which it will be exceeded, and of the date on which the ship will probably commission, are matters still under consideration, and on which no definite reply can at the present moment be given. It is not desirable to anticipate the usual date for giving an outline of the new programme of shipbuilding.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the latter part of my Question.

MR. MCKENNA: I have stated that it is not desirable to anticipate the usual date for the production of next year's Navy Estimates.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: Then I understand that the Admiralty accept with a light heart all delays in the shipbuilding programme?

MR. MCKENNA: No, Sir; the hon. Member must not take that view, for undoubtedly the Admiralty regard it as very serious, and I can assure the hon. Member that it will be taken into account in next year's Estimates.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Could not a clause be inserted preventing employers reducing wages during the currency of a contract?

MR. MCKENNA: I do not see how that arises out of the Question. I must ask for notice.

Naval Destroyers.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Admiralty adheres to the official statement that the sixteen destroyers of this year's programme will be completed next year.

MR. McKENNA: The only statement which I can find to which my hon. friend can refer, is an uncorrected report of a speech of mine on the 13th July last. If this is in fact what the hon. Member refers to, it should be corrected, as would indeed appear obvious from the context, by saying that the destroyers of this year's programme will be completed in the calendar year 1910.

MR. BELLAIRS: Could not the right hon. Gentleman in future revise his speeches of this nature, because it is a great inconvenience, and the meaning is not at all obvious by the context?

MR. McKENNA: I must differ from my hon. friend with regard to that.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty in view of the fact that the new British destroyers will be slower than the new destroyers of other great foreign Powers, what steps are being taken to secure that they shall be able to gain the necessary intelligence about hostile fleets, and guard our own battleships and big cruisers, without being cut off and captured or destroyed by the greater speed of hostile destroyers.

MR. McKENNA: It is not possible within the limits of a Parliamentary Question and Answer to discuss the various requirements and contingencies for which the new destroyers are designed, even if it were in the public interest to do so, but the hon. Member may rest assured that they have been designed with a complete appreciation of the purposes for which they would be required in war, as dictated by recent experience in exercises at sea.

MR. HUNT: May I ask will not these destroyers be at a permanent disadvantage either in scouting, forcing a fight, or trying to escape when attacked by superior numbers; and is it not the fact that Germany will have about the same number of destroyers in March, 1911, under eleven years of age?

MR. McKENNA: No, Sir; I cannot agree with any of the statements of the hon. Member.

Reinstatement of Devonport Labourers.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can give the names of the eight skilled labourers who have been transferred to the smiths' department at Devonport or reinstated; and whether there are any more vacancies for smiths in that department.

MR. McKENNA: The names of the eight smiths referred to are: Wilcocks, Tucker, Ferguson, Vickery, Young, Sutton, Hawken and Widdicombe. There are no more vacancies for smiths at present.

Victualling Yard Stores Reserves.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can state the amount of milk, flour, tea, clothing, and boots there was in stock during the week ending 21st November, at the victualling yards, Royal Clarence, Royal William, and Royal Victoria.

MR. McKENNA: It is not considered in the interest of the public service to give information as to reserves of provisions or stores maintained for the Fleet

Naval Visits to South Africa.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware of the official character of the visit of a squadron of armoured cruisers to South Africa; and whether he is able to state to the House the terms of the farewell message of the admiral commanding to the British Colonies of South Africa.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): I am not aware what force my hon. friend attaches to the word "official," but a visit of a squadron of armoured cruisers cannot in any sense be regarded as unofficial. No official report has been received of the farewell remarks alleged to have been made by the rear-admiral commanding the squadron.

*MR. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): May I ask whether it is the case that Sir Percy Scott said that "the kindness and hospitality of the South

Africans in height equalled the top of Natal's Cassatogel's Nest, in depth rivalled the deepest mines of the Transvaal, in breadth were as boundless as the rolling plains of Orange River Colony, and in stability were comparable to Cape Colony's majestic Table Mountain" and whether in view of this interesting specimen it is not proposed to lay the message?

COLONEL SEELY: We have no official information. If Sir Percy Scott did say that, I do not see that we have any cause to complain.

British Indians in the Transvaal.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the sentences passed upon fifty-four British Indians domiciled in the Transvaal for having returned without first having applied for registration have been quashed upon appeal to the Supreme Court of the Colony; whether a number of other British Indians are actually undergoing hard labour sentences for doing exactly the same thing; and whether the Secretary of State will make representations in the matter of their release, compensation for wrongful imprisonment, and their admission into the Colony.

COLONEL SEELY: The attention of the Secretary of State has been drawn to a Press report of a judgment of the Supreme Court of the Colony, the exact effect of which is not clear. He has telegraphed to the Governor for further information, and pending his reply I regret that I am not in a position to make any statement.

Treaty of Berlin.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in the event of a conference being called for the reconsideration of the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin, His Majesty's Government will endeavour to secure the observance of the engagements undertaken by Roumania towards her Jewish subjects in that Treaty.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. MCKINNON WOOD, Glasgow, St. Rollox): This Question would be beyond the scope of a conference summoned to deal with the difficulties arising out of recent events in the Balkan Peninsula.

Income Tax on Patent Royalties.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that the Inland Revenue Commissioners contend that the income of an inventor derived from patent royalties is, under the Finance Act of 1907, not to be treated as earned income, but is liable to the full tax of 1s. in the pound instead of 9d., which is the rate allowed on incomes earned by other professional and scientific labours; and will he state upon what section of the Act the contention is founded.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): Where an inventor sells outright his patent rights, the sum realised from the sale is regarded as capital and is not taxed. Where an inventor has not parted with his patent rights, but allows another person to work the patent in consideration of a payment of a royalty, the resulting income is regarded as unearned income derived from property.

Unpresented Banknotes.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, with reference to the £14,055 written off by the Bank of England on the 10th instant as the value of notes issued but not presented for payment, he can state what number of years this amount covers; whether it represents the full value of notes issued but not presented in that period; at what intervals the Bank of England writes off such sums; when the last sum was written off and what period it covered; and what is the annual average of sums appropriated by the Bank of England on that account.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Once in every year the Bank writes off the value of the notes which have then been outstanding for forty years and have not previously been written off. In 1907 the outstanding notes dated prior to 1867 were written off. This year the outstanding notes dated prior to 1868 have been written off. Accordingly, the sum of £14,055 represents the value of the notes issued in 1867 which had not been presented on 28th October last. The average of the amounts written off in the last six years was £11,794.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: May I take it, then, that the right hon. Gentleman was not accurately informed the other day, when he told the House that this covered a period of forty years?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: What I said was that that deduction represented notes issued forty years ago.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I have the Answer here. It is that "the total value of the notes issued for the past forty years and not presented for repayment." The right hon. Gentleman therefore misled the House.

MR. HODGE (Lancashire, Gorton): Is not this a hen-roost to commandeer without injury to anyone?

Terminable Annuities.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the amounts payable each year in respect of terminable annuities are in any way revised from time to time in consideration of movements in the value of Government securities.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, Sir. Where terminable annuities have been set up for the purpose of replacing a definite amount of stock within a definite period, it is the practice to readjust the amount of the annuities periodically according to the price at which stock has been purchased. The procedure is regulated by Section 4 of the National Debt Act, 1883. The latest readjustment was effected by Treasury warrants which were laid before this House on 11th June last.

Old-Age Pension Claimants.

MR. TIMOTHY DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state the number of persons over seventy years of age in England, Wales (including Monmouthshire Scotland, and Ireland; whether he can give the number of such persons in receipt of Poor Law relief in each part of the Kingdom; the number of claims for old-age pensions up to date; and the percentage of persons claiming old-age pensions to the population over seventy years of age in each country, deducting those who are in receipt of Poor Law relief.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE: The Return is not yet ready.

Press Representation at Coroner's Inquest.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, at an inquest held at the coroner's Court of St. Giles's, London, on the 21st inst., the coroner's officer refused to admit the representatives of three news agencies and numerous daily papers, whilst admitting two journalists; whether he is aware that a written protest handed to the coroner's officer was not delivered to the coroner, and will he say what notice has been taken of the incident; and what steps has been or will be taken, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent its repetition in that or any other coroner's court.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am making inquiry, but have not yet received the coroner's report.

Restrictions on the Employment of Children.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, seeing that the general restrictions on employment of children contained in The Employment of Children Act, 1903, are not affected by the provisions of the Children Bill, he is taking any, and what, steps to call the attention of all concerned to the non-enforcement of subsections 4 and 5 of Section 3, provisions of universal application, agreed to by Parliament on the suggestion of the Home Office, and forbidding in regard to persons under the age of fourteen the carrying of weights and employment in occupations likely to be injurious to the child.

MR. GLADSTONE: So far as regards the industries to which the Factory Act applies, the factory inspectors are charged with the duty of enforcing the provisions to which the right hon. Baronet refers; and I have, in accordance with the promise I gave on the Estimates recently issued fresh instructions to them with a view to the more effective enforcement of the law. In the case of the miscellaneous industries not under the Home Office jurisdiction, the local authority is responsible for the enforcement of the provisions. I should be obliged if my right hon. friend will communicate to me any information in his possession showing that they have not been enforced in these industries. I would point out, however, in the first place, that the bulk of the employment is in light occupations, such as newspaper delivery, delivery of parcels and the like. The Interdepartmental Committee found that employment in such occupations for moderate hours was beneficial rather than injurious to health. In the second place, as regards occupations of a heavier character, local authorities in many cases have had regard to this when framing bye-laws under Section 1 of the Act, either by restricting the number of hours, or prohibiting the employment altogether in certain cases. If it should appear necessary, I shall be prepared to call the attention of the local authorities again to the provisions.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: It can be enforced by anyone?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes.

Chinese Immigrants at Liverpool.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can give particulars of the number of Chinese who landed at Liverpool in 1907; whether they came in emigrant ships and were passed as desirable immigrants by the Emigration Committee under the Alien Act; and if any Chinese were naturalised as British subjects in 1907.

MR. GLADSTONE: The numbers of Chinese immigrants landing at Liverpool are so small that they are not separately tabulated in the Annual Reports under the Aliens Act. For the year 1907 they are included in, and I believe form a very small proportion of, the 282 persons of "other nationalities" shown in Table XVII. of the Report for that year. To ascertain the exact numbers would involve a long and laborious search, which I do not feel justified in undertaking. No Chinese appeared before the Immigration Board at Liverpool in 1907. Only one Chinaman, living in London, was naturalised in 1907.

MR. FELL: Are Chinese who are employed on ships allowed to land without being subject to the provisions of the Aliens Act?

*MR. GLADSTONE: They are subject to the usual conditions of the Merchant Shipping Act.

Lostock Gralam Crossing Fatality.

MR. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to a fatal accident which recently occurred at Lostock Gralam, in Cheshire, owing to a collision between a motor car and a railway train at a level crossing; and if he proposes to hold an inquiry as to the possibility of doing away with this level crossing, and so doing away with a public danger.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): I am in communication with the Cheshire Lines Committee as to the means adopted for protecting the crossing, and I will inform my hon. friend of the result.

America and the Law of Copyright.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the United States of America participate in the Copyright Union; and, if not, whether any steps that might be taken to modify the arrangement between this country and America, with a view to the removal of its prejudicial effect on the British printing trade, would necessarily involve any sacrifice on the part of this country of the advantages of participating in the Copyright Union.

MR. CHURCHILL: The United States of America do not belong to the Copyright Union but sent delegates to the recent conference at Berlin. Any steps taken with a view to making printing in this country a condition of copyright would involve the withdrawal of Great Britain from the union, as it would scarcely be feasible to impose such a condition on British subjects without also imposing it on all foreigners. I am afraid that there is no indication that the United States are likely to modify their printing regulations.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS: But how is it that a modification of the law would involve the withdrawal of this country from the Copyright Union?

MR. CHURCHILL said that in order to secure copyright in the United States for British subjects this country must permit citizens of the United States copyright on substantially the same basis as enjoyed by themselves, and any clause enforced against American citizens would equally have to be enforced against British subjects.

Betting Telegrams.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the prosecution at the Hereford Assizes of a sub-postmaster, at the public expense, in connection with betting telegrams; whether these telegrams were sent to addresses in the United Kingdom or in Holland; whether they were telegrams to make illegal bets for which cash had been received in advance; and whether steps can be taken to prevent the public services being used for assisting in this illegal business.

I beg further to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the remarks of the Judge at the Hereford Assizes as to the part taken by the Post Office with regard to betting business; and whether, in view of the evidence given on lotteries before the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament as to the practice of the American and Australian postal authorities, he can take steps to prevent money being received for such illegal business.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): My attention has been called to the prosecution of the sub-postmaster of Stretton-Sugwas and others in connection with betting telegrams, and to the remarks of the Judge thereon. If the Judge's remarks are correctly reported, I cannot but think that they were made under a misapprehension. He speaks of the responsibility of the Post Office in allowing betting telegrams to pass; but I have no power to stop such telegrams which, I am advised, are as a rule not illegal. The telegrams were for addresses in the United Kingdom, but of course no cash was received at the Post Office with them in respect of the bets. I may refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1902, in which they reported that they did not consider it would be possible for the Postmaster-General to make any distinction between the facilities afforded to betting telegrams and other telegrams.

Publicans as Postmasters.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, according to the rules of the Department, a licensed publican can be appointed to be a postmaster; has he made any appointment or appointments of licensed persons to be postmasters in Ireland recently; and, if so, were there any other applicants.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Under the rules of the Department a licensed publican is ineligible for appointment as a postmaster, and exception is only made when no other suitable person is available. Two persons holding licences for the sale of drink have been appointed sub-postmasters in Ireland during the present year; in each case there was no other applicant, and the post office had previously been conducted on licensed premises.

Board of Education Circular 596.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, whether the phrase, "He will," with reference to a school medical officer, occurring seven times in paragraph 7 (*a*) of the Board of Education Circular, 596, is intended as an expression of opinion or is used in a mandatory sense; and, if the latter, by what authority the Board of Education gives direction to the employees of local education authorities.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): The words "He will" are obviously used in the paragraph referred to in an advisory, and I hope I may say a prophetic sense. I cannot imagine any local education authority would take exception to the expression, and as a matter of fact no local education authority has offered the slightest objection to the wording or contents of the paragraph.

MR. ASHLEY: Has the hon. Gentleman received a communication from local authorities to the effect that there are strong objections to the wording of the paragraph?

MR. TREVELYAN was understood to say he was not so informed.

Status of Educational and Medical Officers.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, whether the Board has taken upon itself under Section 13 (1) (*b*) of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act, 1907, the task of deciding the relative status of educational and medical officers employed and paid by local education authorities.

MR. TREVELYAN: I am not sure what the hon. Member means, but I am not aware of any decisions of the Board to which his description would apply.

Board of Education Circular 576.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the last three lines of page 8 of the Board of Education Circular 576 are the only part of that Circular which it is not *ultra vires* for the Board to promulgate or to enforce; and whether, as stated on page 11, that Circular is of a preliminary nature only.

MR. TREVELYAN: The Circular No. 576 was obviously of a preliminary character, as it was issued on the 22nd November, 1907. It was certainly the duty of the Board not to leave local education authorities without such advice and guidance in the initiation of the work of medical inspection as in the Board's opinion would conduce to efficiency and economy, and such advice and guidance have in fact been heartily welcomed by local education authorities and their officers (with very few exceptions) throughout the country. The question of enforcing the Circular has not arisen, and, indeed, cannot arise.

MR. ASHLEY: Am I to understand that advice only in that direction is given by the Board of Education?

MR. TREVELYAN: I think that is so.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, as stated on page 4 of the Board of Education Circular 576, relating to medical inspection, it is the duty of the Board, under the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act, to give directions to local education authorities regarding the method of inspection; and, if not, whether he will withdraw the Circular so giving directions.

MR. TREVELYAN: I do not think the Circular can be properly described as in fact giving directions on points outside the Board's competence. The whole Circular was, as was stated in paragraph 18, of a preliminary nature only; the matter is now dealt with definitely in the Code.

Grants to Denominational Schools.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can say what amount per head of children in average attendance would be received by associations of Jewish, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, and Church of England schools respectively, on the assumption that the managers of all these schools, other than schools which are the only schools in rural parishes, are able and willing to avail themselves of the provisions of Clause 3 of the Education Bill now before the House.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): At the same time may I ask the President of the Board of Education whether his Board has computed what will be the average grant payable to Catholic and Jewish schools, respectively, under the scale provided for by the first Schedule to the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, calculated upon the present attendance of children at these two sections of schools.

MR. TREVELYAN: If it were assumed that every existing Jewish school and Roman Catholic school (except those in the single school parishes) became a contracted-out school, and further that each such school still retained the full number of children now attending it, the total sums then payable in respect of the twelve Jewish schools after applying the scales of grant given in the Schedule, would represent an average grant of 47s. 6d. per child, because more than half of the 10,000 children in Jewish schools are congregated in two schools of very large size, thus involving the application of the lowest rate on the scale to more than half of the whole average attendance. The same figure in the case of the Roman Catholic schools would represent an average grant per child of 49s. 8d., there being but very few large schools of that denomination. But it is probable, especially in the case of Roman Catholic schools, that many of the children now attending those schools will take advantage of the freedom in future to be given by the Bill to demand an undenominational school; and this diminution of the attendance would, by altering the size of many of the schools, increase the rate of grant under the scale, whether the second paragraph of the Schedule were applied or not. For these and similar reasons the average figures above given, for Jewish and Roman Catholic schools, are no more than approximately true, even given the large assumptions made in arriving at them. As regards Church of England schools, the assumptions referred to at the commencement of my reply cannot be made; indeed, the policy of the Government's educational proposals is based on the opposite assumptions, viz., that contracting-out will be the exception and not the rule as regards Church of England schools. Until it is known which of the Church of England schools will contract out, and the respective sizes of the Church of England contracting-out schools are thus known, it is impossible to know what will be the scales of grant in each case, and, therefore, impossible to make even an approximate estimate as to either the total grant or the average grant per child.

Expenditure of Local Education Authority.

MR. JAMES HOPE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will grant an immediate Return showing, for the year 1907–8 (or, if that be impossible, for 1906–7), the average sums per child spent by local authorities as set forth for former years in the Report of the Departmental Committee on Education Rates, 1907, pages 5 and 136–187 (Cd. 2213, of 1907).

MR. TREVELYAN: I arranged yesterday that there should be available to-day in the Votes Office copies of a statement showing the average expenditure by local education authorities on the maintenance of public elementary schools, obtained from the financial statements on the audited accounts of the authorities. This gives the information asked for by the hon. Member in a better shape than that which he suggests.

MR. JAMES HOPE: Will it be for 1907–8 or for 1906–7?

MR. TREVELYAN: I am afraid I cannot say.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Is it available now?

MR. TREVELYAN: It ought to be.

Swansea Education Dispute.

LORD R. CECIL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what decision he has arrived at with respect to the teachers in voluntary schools at Swansea.

MR. TREVELYAN: I have to-day received legal advice, which is under my consideration. The Report of the Public Inquiry will be deposited in accordance with Section 73 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870.

LORD R. CECIL: Will it be published?

MR. TREVELYAN: It will be made available for the noble Lord.

Education Bill—"Children in Attendance."

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the expression "children in attendance" in Clause 3, subsection (3), and in the First Schedule of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill is to be taken to mean the average attendance or the number entered on the school rolls.

MR. TREVELYAN: It is intended that the basis should be as nearly as possible the number of children who actually attend the school day by day, using as few artificial or estimated figures as may be practicable. For this reason my right hon. friend has not inserted in the Bill the particular method of calculating average attendance now in vogue, which is artificial. If no better basis of calculation is found to be practicable, the present basis will of course be adhered to; but my right hon. friend is hopeful that some more satisfactory method may be evolved, both for this, and for other purposes of administering the Grants.

Parents and Religious Instruction in Schools.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board has yet considered in what form parents are to express a desire under the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill that their children should receive religious or denominational instruction in public schoools; and whether the regulations provided for in Section 2, subsection (5) will be laid upon the Table of the House before the vote upon the Second Reading of the Bill is taken.

MR. TREVELYAN: I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answer which my right hon. friend gave to the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone yesterday, which was circulated with the Votes this morning.

River Tweed Salmon Fisheries.

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any of the rights of the Crown to salmon fisheries in the River Tweed near Neidpath, and adjacent reaches of the river in Peeblesshire, have been alienated or demised to private individuals; and, if so, for what term of years and at what rent.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The Answer is in the negative. I have requested the Commissioners of Wood and Forests to enter into negotiations with the town council of Peebles with a view to that body leasing the fishing in the part of the Tweed referred to.

SIR J. JARDINE: Have no leases been granted by the Crown?

*MR. HOBHOUSE: This matter has been under my very careful consideration and investigation. There has been no lease of any property rights, so far as I can ascertain, to any riparian owner on the Tweed. The Crown has certain rights which it is essential should be maintained, and I think the best method of preserving them, and of meeting public sentiment in the locality referred to above, is to lease them to town councils and other public bodies, when these will pay a fair rent.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease.

In reply to a Question of which private notice had been given by Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford),

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): I am glad to say that the Board of Agriculture up to now have not received from our Ambassador at Washington information of any fresh outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease outside the prohibited States. I may also add that the Federal Government have been so good as to inform us that they will cable us if the outbreak spreads outside the prohibited States.

Lansdowne Estate, Queen's County.

MR. P. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Daniel Whelan, a tenant on the Lansdowne estate at Luggacurren, Queen's County, was evicted in 1888 from Barrow House farm, containing 182 acres, and that Mr. Whelan's stock and crops were seized on and sold by the landlord; whether he is aware that Mr. Whelan's farm is at present occupied by a planter named Henry Hosie, and that Hosie holds 584 acres; whether the evicted tenant's grandson and sole representative has applied for restoration to his grandfather's farm; whether his claim has been admitted by the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, whether the Commissioners will acquire Barrow House farm for the restoration of the evicted tenant's representative.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that an application has been lodged by Patrick Kelly, Daniel Whelan's son-in-law, praying that his son John Kelly may be reinstated in a farm from which Daniel Whelan was evicted in 1887. Patrick Kelly is the owner of 200 acres of land. The farm in question has since been purchased under the Land Purchase Acts and is in the occupation of a tenant purchaser. The Estates Commissioners do not intend to take any action in the matter.

MR. P. MEEHAN: Did not the grandson of the evicted tenant claim reinstatement, and was not the claim rejected on the ground that the kinship was too remote?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know how that may be.

River Barrow Floods.

MR. P. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that for the last thirty years the medical and sanitary officers within the flooded area of the River Barrow have declared that pulmonary diseases, consumption, pneumonia, and typhus fever, which were rife in their districts, were caused by the annual flooding from the River Barrow; whether he is aware if the flooding from this river is becoming more widespread and destructive every year; whether the Government intend to take any steps to cope with this evil; whether the highest medical and sanitary authorities have declared that the effects of the annual flooding from the River Barrow is destructive alike of the health and property of the people and a breeding ground for tuberculosis; and whether expert engineering authority has declared that it is impossible for local effort to successfully cope with the evil.

MR. BIRRELL: I regret that I can add nothing to my replies to previous Questions on this subject, in which I stated that having regard to the many other projects now afoot for expenditure in Ireland, the Government could hold out no present hope of obtaining a grant from Parliament for the drainage of the Barrow.

Firearm Outrages in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of crimes classified as agrarian and non-agrarian respectively under each of the headings, firing at the person and firing into dwellings, for the period of ten months ended 31st October, 1908.

MR. BIRRELL: During the ten months ended 31st October last, the numbers of crimes classified as agrarian and non-agrarian under each of the headings mentioned were as follows:—Firing at the person—agrarian eleven, non-agrarian twenty-three; firing into dwellings—agrarian sixty, non-agrarian nineteen.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Is it not the fact that the non-agrarian crimes are lower in proportion to population than is the case with any other population in Europe?

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): And did not most of the twenty-three non-agrarian cases occur in Ulster?

*MR. P. MEEHAN: And in the total is there included the cases of four armed emergency men who fired on and wounded two Catholic peasants on the 2nd May last at Abbeyleix, Queen's County?

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of outrages in Ireland recorded as agrarian and non-agrarian, respectively, in which firearms were used, during the periods of ten months ended 31st October, 1906, 1907, and 1908, respectively.

MR. BIRRELL: During the ten months ended 31st October in each of the years mentioned, the numbers of indictable offences in which firearms were used in Ireland were as follows:—1906, agrarian twenty, non-agrarian thirty-four; 1907, agrarian fifty-one, non-agrarian forty-seven; 1908, agrarian 120, non-agrarian fifty-seven.

Persons under Police Protection.

MR LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of persons receiving constant police protection and protection by patrols throughout Ireland on the 31st October, 1908.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that on the 31st October last seventy-six persons were under constant police protection and 251 under protection by patrols.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): And how many of these qualified for police protection in order to supply hon. Gentleman above the gangway with material for Questions and to enable Lord Ashtown to keep up his list of Irish grievances?

[No Answer was returned.]

Boycotting in Ireland.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of cases and of persons boycotted in Ireland on the 30th September and the 31st October, 1908, in the same form in which the information was given in Parliamentary Paper, No. 89, of last Session.

Mr. BIRRELL: I will, with the hon. Member's permission, publish with to-night's Votes a tabular statement giving the required information.

Agrarian Outrages.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of agrarian outrages reported to the Inspector-General in the years 1906 and 1907, and in the period of ten months ended 31st October, 1908.

Mr. BIRRELL: The number of agrarian offences reported was:—234 in 1906, 372 in 1907, and 489 in the ten months ended 31st October, 1908.

Mr. BARRIE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of persons who were arrested for agrarian offences during the past twelve months, and brought before a single resident magistrate out of petty sessions with a view to their being bound over to future good behaviour under the Act of Edward III.

Mr. BIRRELL: It would not be possible to give this information without making inquiries in every petty sessions district throughout the country, and this would take some time.

Irish Nationalist Newspapers.

Mr. BARRIE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of the newspapers the proprietors of which have been warned against the publication of resolutions of United Irish League branches of an intimidatory and illegal character.

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not think that any good purpose would be served by giving a list of these newspapers.

Mr. BARRIE: Is not this Question of sufficient public importance for the reply to be given to the House?

Mr. BIRRELL: I think the less said the better.

Mr. BARRIE: What has been the result of the friendly notice?

[No Answer was returned.]

Knockmay Alleged Outrage.

Mr. P. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware if District Inspector Irwin, Head Constable Marnane, and Sergeant Monaghan, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Maryborough, Queen's County, have been censured in connection with an alleged burning outrage at Knockmay, Queen's County; whether he is aware that a claim for malicious injury was made in connection with this burning, and investigated at Maryborough Quarter Sessions, on the 17th October last, before Judge Fitzgerald, and that the claim was dismissed with costs; and can he say what was the offence for which District Inspector Irwin, Head Constable Marnane, and Sergeant Monaghan were censured.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether information of the burning at Knockmay, Queen's County, was given to Sergeant

Monaghan at 3.30 p.m. on the 20th July last by a youth, named Thompson; whether Sergeant Monaghan immediately reported the matter to the head constable and district inspector; whether the officers visited the land where the burning took place the same evening, and Sergeant Monaghan discovered that the burning was accidentally caused by children living in an adjacent cottage, the eldest of whom was only five years old; whether evidence was obtained that Thompson's information was deliberately concocted; and, if so, whether in view of this fact and of his knowledge of Thompson's previous character, he will explain why County Inspector Tweedy ordered his evidence to be acted on, and warrants to be obtained for the arrest of three men who had been named by Thompson as having caused the burning; and will he explain why County Inspector Tweedy has been promoted to the county inspectorship of Queen's County.

I beg further to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sergeant Monaghan, Royal Irish Constabulary, had thirteen years service at the county headquarters station at Maryborough, Queen's County; that he was frequently complimented by the bench for the able and efficient discharge of his duties; and that he had been recommended for promotion by two former county inspectors; and will he explain why this officer has been transferred under censure to one of the most unimportant stations in the county, where he has to live apart from his wife and children.

MR. BIRRELL: The district inspector, head constable, and sergeant, were admonished by the Inspector-General for neglect of duty in not taking sufficiently prompt steps to investigate a case of alleged malicious burning of straw at Knockmay. The fact that a claim for compensation was subsequently dismissed with costs does not in any way exonerate these police officers. The sergeant was subsequently transferred from Maryborough to Castletown in the interests of the public service and not as a punishment. Upon his own application he is now to be transferred to Mountrath, where there is better accommodation for his family. As proceedings are pending against Joseph Thompson for perjury in connection with the case of alleged malicious burning, it is not desirable to enter into further particulars of the matter. Mr. Tweedy was promoted to rank of county inspector as being the senior officer fully qualified for promotion.

*MR. P. MEEHAN asked if this county inspector was examined at the inquiry into the Glenaheary outrage in support of Lord Ashtown; was it for this he was promoted?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.) asked if he was the man who eight years since was associated at Milltown Malbay with the notorious Sergeant Sheridan?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know.

Drainage of the Barrow.

MR. P. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the number of unemployed in Ireland, any portion of the funds voted by Parliament for the unemployed will be made available for Ireland; and whether, in view of the urgency of the drainage of the River Barrow, he will recommend some portion of the money to be expended in carrying out the partial drainage works recommended by the drainage committee and approved of by the county engineers of Kildare and Queen's County.

MR. BIRRELL: A portion of the fund voted by Parliament for the unemployed has already been made available for Dublin and Belfast, and applications from other towns are under consideration. As I have already stated, the object of the grant is to supplement local contributions raised for the purpose of providing employment in those districts in which, owing to severe trade depression temporarily affecting local industries, the able-bodied working men have found themselves suddenly deprived, wholly or in part, of their usual means of earning a livelihood. It would not be possible to make grants to rural districts in which there is only the dearth of work among agricultural labourers usual at this period of the year.

Armagh Labourers Cottage Scheme.

MR. McKILLOP (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that John Moore and other labourers in the Armagh rural district applied for labourers' cottages to the Armagh Rural District Council; that their first application was declared informal by the Local Government Board inspector, who recommended them to make fresh applications, and that these fresh applications were rejected by this council; what steps the Local Government Board will take to have the recommendation of their inspector carried out; and whether this council, for a number of years past, has refused to put the Labourers Act into force or to use the money grant given to them for this purpose.

MR. BIRRELL: The applications of John Moore and some other labourers were rejected by the district council, and were therefore not included in the scheme which they submitted in April last. The council subsequently reconsidered their decision, at the suggestion of the Local Government Board inspector, and allowed Moore and thirteen other labourers to send in fresh representations. Nine of these fourteen applications, including Moore's, have now been approved. Ninety cottages have already been authorised in this rural district.

Morrogh Bernard Evicted Tenant.

MR. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why the Estates Commissioners have not paid the grant promised by numerous inspectors during the last year and a half to Mr. Morty Buckley, evicted tenant on the Morrogh Bernard estate, county Kerry; and if he can now state the cause of delay.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that Morty Buckley has declined to proceed with the purchase of a farm, which he agreed to purchase from the owner, unless the owner also sells him another farm. The Commissioners are not prepared to make Buckley any advance for the purchase of the latter farm, and will not make him any grant in respect of the first-mentioned farm until they are satisfied that he intends to work it.

Lord Kenmare's Estate.

MR. J. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can ascertain from the Congested Districts Board the exact cause why they have failed to make any effort to purchase the congested portions of Lord Kenmare's estate, county Kerry, whereas they are at present engaged in negotiating for the purchase of Lord Ventry's estate in the same county, though Lord Kenmare's estate was first offered to them.

MR. BIRRELL: The terms on which the congested portion of Lord Kenmare's estate was offered to the Congested Districts Board were not such as they could have accepted, even had money been available for the purchase. Until pending legislation has been passed, the state of the Board's funds will not permit of their purchasing any estates beyond those for which they are already in negotiation. They have been in negotiation for the Ventry estate for the past twelve months.

MR. BELLOC: Is that the main cause or the only cause just now?

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): The main cause is the absence of money.

MR. BIRRELL: With regard to the Kenmare estate I may say that the terms under which it was suggested that the tenants should be put into possession of the holdings were such that the Board could not possibly accept them.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Is not the absence of money due largely to the enormous inflation of prices?

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. J. MURPHY inquired whether the reason the Congested Districts Board did not purchase was not simply because the vendors wanted to fix the prices themselves?

MR. BIRRELL: I have given the one reason for their action, and I have nothing to add.

MR. J. MURPHY: My reason is the correct one.

Macroom Labourer's Cottage.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a report has yet been received as to the grounds on which the application of William Sheehan, Ballymakeera, in the Macroom rural district, for a labourer's cottage was repealed by the County Court Judge after having been passed by the Local Government Board inspector; whether he is aware that the present system of appeal is causing dissatisfaction amongst the labourers; whether complaints to this effect have been already brought under his notice; and will he state what steps he intends to take in the matter.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the grounds on which John Cottar had his application for a cottage in the Macroom rural district rejected on appeal by the County Court Judge; whether he is aware that the petitioner, Mary Scriven, in addition to holding thirty acres of land, was also proved to be a postmistress and owner of a number of houses, and therefore would not suffer excessively by an allotment being taken out of her farm, and that the applicant proved that the house in which he lived was built against a sand-bank, was unfit for habitation, and was the abode of snails; and, seeing that the County Court Judge suggested that Cottar might be given a half-acre plot, will he explain why his claim was rejected, and why he and an aged father and mother were condemned to remain in their present miserable dwelling-place; and can anything be now done to provide him with a cottage and plot of land.

I beg further to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the grounds on which the County Court Judge refused the application of Patrick Twohig for a cottage and plot of land on the holding of John Delece, at Carrigleigh, in the Macroom rural district; whether his attention has been called to the evidence upon which the claim of this man to a better dwelling was sustained before the inspector of the Local Government Board and the County Court Judge; whether he is aware that it was proved by the engineer of the district council that the petitioner had a sufficiency of arable land out of which to grant an allotment for a labourer; and what steps, if any, will be taken to provide Twohig with a suitable dwelling.

MR. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have no information as to the proceedings in the County Court on the hearing of the appeals in these three cases, nor have they any authority to inquire as to the grounds of the decisions of the County Court Judge. His decision on an appeal under the Labourers Acts is final, and a labourer whose application is disallowed can only apply once more to the district council with a view to being provided with a cottage under a new scheme.

Valentia Island Coastguard Station.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade which Coastguard stations it is proposed to abolish between Valentia Island and Bantry Bay; and whether it is proposed to leave forty miles of coastline, which is the first land reached by ships crossing the Atlantic without a life-saving station.

MR. CHURCHILL: I understand that under the arrangement announced last spring it is proposed to close during the next few months the redundant coastguard stations at Ballinskelligs and Ballycrovane, and that pending the consideration of the general policy relating to the Coastguard no action will be taken in regard to closing any other Coastguard stations between Valentia Island and Bantry Bay. It is not proposed to abolish any life-saving station between the points mentioned.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): Is it within the right hon. Gentleman's knowledge that within the past two months the Coastguard by descending a cliff some 400 feet rescued the crew of a shipwrecked Russian vessel?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir.

MR. JOYCE: Then that should be a reason for not abolishing this station.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked when the House would be in possession of the terms of the guillotine Resolution for future stages of the Education Bill; and also what would be the business for Monday and Tuesday next.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): The Answer to the first part of the right hon. Gentleman's Question is, To-morrow. The Committee stage of the Education Bill will be taken on Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the great inconvenience that will follow from proceeding so quickly with a Bill with the provisions of which we have only just been made acquainted? Does he not think that the cause of conciliation would be better served by giving a little more time for consideration and for communication between the parties interested?

Mr. ASQUITH: I do not think so. I have followed the matter very carefully indeed, with the anxious desire—no one is more interested in it than I am—for general conciliation and agreement.

Lord R. CECIL asked what time would be available for hon. Members interested to put down Amendments for the Committee stage. How could they in so short a time give proper consideration to the Bill? If the right hon. Gentleman really hoped that this was to be in any degree a settlement of this question he ought to treat the House with something like decent courtesy and respect.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I also should like to point out how very inconvenient it will be to discuss Amendments without proper notice. I wish further to ask when we shall have in our hands the financial statement promised by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. ASQUITH: It is already in the Vote Office.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE asked whether it would not meet the convenience of the House if the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill were taken on Monday, so as to give proper time for the consideration of Amendments to the Education Bill.

Mr. ASQUITH: We hope to take that Bill to-morrow evening. I think there will be ample time to hand in Amendments to-morrow and Friday.

Lord R. CECIL: Can the right hon. Gentleman give any precedent whatever for the treatment of a first-class Government measure in the way in which it is proposed to treat this measure?

Mr. ASQUITH: It is really an unprecedented measure.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): Why not take the Second Reading of the Irish Land Bill on Monday?

[No Answer was returned.]

CRIMINAL APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 336.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 336.]

Bill (not amended) to be taken into consideration To-morrow.

WHITE PHOSPHORUS MATCHES PROHIBITION BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 337.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 337.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 383.]

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 384.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill): Mr. Curran; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards.

Report to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No. 2) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The Prime Minister has already stated that the Bill, the Second Reading of which I am now about to move, is an unprecedented measure. Its genesis is peculiar to itself, and I freely admit that it is open to hon. Gentlemen opposite and to others in the country to say that it is not our first attempt to deal with the education problem. Education Bills in the past have been introduced, and have not gone through. We are not peculiar in being open to the charge that our proposals have not been carried into effect. But my predecessors who have had charge of previous Bills lived in much stormier times than these; and I am glad to think that the difficulties which faced my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland and my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Admiralty have not surrounded me. When I came into office I already found that the atmosphere was considerably altered. Not that both sides did not cling just as tenaciously as before to their principles, but there appeared to me to be a greater readiness on the part of both sides to understand, or to attempt to understand, the principles of their opponents, and greater eagerness to find methods upon which to base compromise without sacrifice of principle. It was only possible by the exercise of mutual forbearance and respect to reach the present stage in this controversy, and now I hope we have arrived at the stage when we can secure a settlement by mutual concessions. I admit that much was to be conceded on both sides, and in order to ascertain with clearness the course which I should pursue I indulged in *pourparlers* which were quite informal, and I had conferences which lasted over many months. After all, the culpability of a navigator is not in foundering on rocks which he does not see, but in going to sea without a chart. I endeavoured to find out where most of the rocks lay. In the course of these proceedings I found myself easily in touch with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and also, for a short time, with the Archbishop of Westminster as the head of the Roman Catholic Church in England. I did not need to inquire what was the Nonconformist view, for that came naturally to me, but I have not acted without Nonconformist support, and I am very glad to think that in the very long list of those who are informing Professor Sadler that they favour a settlement of this controversy by agreement nearly all the principal leaders of Nonconformity have sent in their names. Throughout these controversies I have endeavoured to put myself in the position partly of an arbitrator, and partly of an honest broker. The House will find in this Bill the result of our labours. It was quite clear from the first that the Church of England regarded herself—and the Roman Catholic Church as well—as the trustee of a particular ideal of religious education. They felt it was their duty to instil denominational doctrine into their children in the day schools, and they were well entrenched in something like 11,000 schools. They were, on the other hand, unable to get access to their own children in the council schools. On the other side, the Nonconformists held strongly that rates could only be applied to educational, as distinct from sectarian, objects. They thought that the attachment of the child to any particular denomination was outside the proper sphere of State action, and therefore it followed that they objected to rate aid for denominational teaching, and to the system by which, though the whole salary of the teacher was provided out of public funds, special opportunities and posts in denominational schools were reserved for teachers of two or three denominations. They felt that the rate-aided denominational schools ought to be under public control, but they rejoiced at the same time that about 9,000 council schools were absolutely free from all denominational influence. And these, happily, were steadily increasing in number. To many people it seemed that the future was in their hands, and we were urged on many sides to leave things as they are. Well, I do not like trusting to a remote and uncertain future. At the best we have not many years during which we could sit in this House and be responsible for the elementary education of this country. For how long were we to wait? After all, during the time that we were waiting, the attention of the public was diverted from the real educational needs of the country. Administrators' time and attention was wasted. Educational reforms were delayed, and the children in our schools consequently suffered, and there was everywhere an increasing sense of shame among religious men that the cause of religion should be the severest handicap which English education had to face. Forty years, it is said, would themselves solve these problems, but we had in the meantime a miserable prospect before us. There would be perennial campaigning, a never-ending war, and the swashbucklers on both sides would be those who enjoyed themselves most. But, to tell the truth, the British people were thoroughly sick of this unending strife. Fortunately we found that there were some underlying points on which both sides were agreed. I think there was a fairly general agreement that we ought, if we could, to avoid purely secular education. I know there was a very strong feeling in favour of it, but the feeling against it was so overwhelming and prompted by such deep feeling that I think that the secular solution could not be generally acceptable, and certainly could not provide a permanent settlement. And I think there was a more general recognition of the value of simple teaching from the Bible, and there was also a feeling that if our principles could be safeguarded, our differences might be adjusted. During the last few months I, of course, have received much advice. Every post brings at least half a dozen absolutely water-tight solutions of the education problem, and now every post brings me objections to larger or smaller details of the present proposal. Well, I think we must say frankly that the proposals now before the House are not the Government's ideal terms, they are not the Noncomformists' ideal terms, and they are not the Church and Roman Catholic ideal terms, but if they were the ideal terms of any one party, they would not then embody a settlement. These terms have been arrived at slowly by eliminating as many points of difference as possible, rather after the fashion as they say in Scotland of making married life comfortable by "makin' soople i' things immaterial." Well, I think we have safeguarded the main principles of both sides, and the leading men of both sides are prepared to acquiesce in the agreement. The settlement embodies not the claims either side thinks itself entitled to make, but the sacrifices which each side is prepared to assent to in the interests of educational and religious peace. As a Government we could not be parties to any settlement which would have involved the infringement of the three pledges everyone on this side of the House, and everyone below the gangway on the other side of the House, I believe, gave to his constituents. In the first place, it was necessary we should secure full public control over all rate aided schools; secondly, that denominational teaching should be taken off the rates; and thirdly, that the teaching profession in rate-aided schools should be open to men and women of all denominations provided they were capable of occupying the posts. We think that we have succeeded in arriving at terms which embody every one of those three pledges. They have been well canvassed in the Press and in papers circulated during the past week, and I do not think it is necessary to run through them in detail. But I would say this, that the Bill is an honest endeavour to embody accurately and with due regard to administrative necessities and possibilities the agreed terms. We have done what we could to safeguard the principles of all parties concerned, and to carry out the proposals in a *bona fide* manner. We have succeeded in getting a number of purely national conditions, and I think we make a considerable gain in arriving for the first time at something in the nature of a really national system. Privately owned schools in the future will be the exception and not the rule. All rate-aided schools will be under the control of the local education authority. Denominational teaching is only to be allowed if paid for by the denomination itself. There is to be no test for any teacher in the schools under the national system, and we have preserved throughout the first three-quarters of an hour of the morning meeting that Cowper-Temple teaching which the experience of forty years justifies. There need be no misapprehension on this point; simple Bible instruction remains the normal religious instruction in the rate-aided schools. We have also provided that there shall be universal facilities for children whose parents express a desire for them to have denominational teaching on two mornings a week. In single-school parishes the school must come under the national system, and the education authority must provide accommodation for every child who desires it—that is, no child shall be forced into a denominational school. Lastly, in all provided schools there will be free education a little in advance of the old Free Education Act. I will now proceed to deal with the conditions in the Bill covering the transfer of schools. The Bill provides for a payment in every case, and in the case of a compulsory transfer gives the measure of that payment. All privately owned schools shall be passed or transferred by agreement, and charitable trust schools may be transferred either absolutely or they may be transferred with the user remaining with the trustees, or they may pass with the user to the local education authority. In other areas all schools must be either State-aided schools or schools transferred by agreement, or, if no agreement is arrived at, then there must be adopted one of the three alternatives I have just described, namely, transferred absolutely, or with user to owners, or user to the local education authority. I have been asked why we attach a scale to the Bill. The scale provides a uniform rate, except in a number of combinations which can be found from the scale. It is said we do not differentiate enough, and that some schools cost more, some less. We must take the country as a whole. If the Church gets too little in some places she will get more in others. A case is put to me to-day in the Press of a school which cost £18,000, which under this Bill will be transferred for £2,000. But that is leaving out of account one of the most important considerations. We must remember that a very large part of the purposes of the trust will have to be carried out by the local education authority, and that the purchase money therefore represents the "other purposes" of the trust. We have to provide for the payment of rent in single-school parishes in small boroughs, and in large urban areas on a basis which will give a substantial sum to the trustees of those schools. Where you have a country school, say, for 100 children, transferred only with the user to the local education authority, the trustees will continue to repair and alter that school, and the rent will be £7 10s. per annum. But if the education authority takes over the liability to repair and alter, then the rent will be reduced to £3 15s. If there is an absolute transfer the rent paid will be £15 a year, and the sale value of £300. In a county borough, a school for 300 children, if the user only is transferred to the local education authority, the rent paid will be £30; if the trustees have user and education authority do repairing, the rent would be £15; but if an absolute transfer the rent will be £56 5s., or on a sale the price £1,125. A large London school for, say, 800 children, if the user is transferred to the local education authority and the trustees do repairing, the rent will be £100; if trustees have user and education authority repair, £50; if transfer absolute, rent £180, or sale value £3,600. If the trustees think the sale value too low they could resort to one of the alternatives, and transfer either with the user to the local education authority or transfer with the user to themselves. But all schools are to come into the national system except schools which are to be provided for under Clause 3. I now pass to another and the most contentious part of the Bill, which is that relating to contracting-out. I admit that contracting-out is most objectionable from an educational point of view. We intend to make it the exception and not the rule, and I believe that is the intention of the other parties to this agreement. There was no possibility of arriving at an agreement with the trustees of the Roman Catholic schools and some of the extreme Church of England schools except by contracting-out, and I, for one, was not prepared to say to them, "You must either come into the national system or be destroyed." But we think it is a great pity that they will not come in without this provision. Objectionable as it is, I think that many trustees, both Churchmen and Roman Catholics, for the sake of their convictions, are prepared to take upon themselves the necessary financial burden in order to retain what they conceive their greatest privilege. But the following conditions will attach to these State-aided schools:—There must be none in single-school parishes; they must have, at least, thirty children; they must attain equal efficiency with the council schools in staff, premises, and in secular instruction; they may be made homogeneous; they must belong to an association of a denomination for England and Wales, only one association for each denomination; the grant to be calculated on the basis of scale; all grants to be paid to the association, which will allocate the grants according to the needs of the school and must spend all grants on maintenance; and they must remain technically public elementary schools. The children in these contracting-out schools shall retain the advantage of such civic services as medical inspection, and may be admitted to cookery centres, handicrafts, and be fed under the Feeding of Children Act. The contracting-out schools will have an opportunity of adding to their income—by pooling the grants or by charging fees—a right which they will retain, but which will, I believe, not be exercised in many cases. But where advantage is taken of the right to charge fees, an income of 30s per annum per child can be raised, which together with the grant of £2 10s. will give an income of £4 per child per year. I come now to the Roman Catholic case. The statement has been made that under this Bill the Catholic schools in London will cost the denomination £35,000 extra in London. I venture to challenge that figure, because it altogether leaves out of the case the pooling arrangements which are made in the Bill. The claim is also made that there are in the Catholic schools something like 300,000 children; there are 284,000 in average attendance, and the whole of these children are not all Roman Catholics. It is only fair to assume, therefore, that if this Bill becomes law a certain number of children now in the Roman Catholic schools will pass out into the local authorities schools. Many of those who are Protestant children would be relieved of attendance at Catholic schools, and will be provided with places elsewhere. In that case we thought it only right, in revising the scale of grants per head which now appears in the schedule, that we should not make it harder owing to the reduction of the number of children in those schools. That is the reason why we have provided a scale giving a higher grant to a small school where the education is dearer, and a smaller grant to a larger school, where the education is cheaper. If we compare the position in England with the position in Scotland, so far as Roman Catholics are concerned, I would observe that the claim put forward by the hon. Member for South Kerry in this House during the last few days, with regard to Catholic schools in Scotland, was that there should be an additional grant of 10s. per child over and above the 38s. 6d. to 40s. which now goes to the contracted-out schools in Scotland. That would bring the figure up to about the same as we propose in this Bill. I observed that the hon. Member who proposed an Amendment to the Scottish Bill a few days ago stated that he would be satisfied with an extra 10s., in other words he would be satisfied with 50s. in Scotland, where education is more expensive than in England. Therefore, I hope they will see their way to be satisfied with 50s. more or less, as we provide in the Bill. The Church of England case is even stronger. If we take it for granted that donors in respect of Church of England education in the future will be no less generous than they had been in the past, the Church of England schools would be provided for by voluntary donations on the same scale varying from 18s. to 20s. according to the extent to which contracting out is taken advantage of. Therefore, I see no reason to suppose that the generous financial arrangements provided for in this Bill will have the effect of closing or hampering the Church of England schools. We wish to restrict contracting out to the smallest limit by reducing the desire to remain outside the national system. That can be done by still allowing the denomination to leave a portion of the burden which I understand it is willing to bear if it wishes to retain its own peculiar privileges, and also by making the rent a substantial one. When I turn to the financial proposals of the Bill, in so far as they concern the local education authority, they are very much the same as they were under the proposals of my right hon. friend now the First Lord of the Admiralty. The present system of grants is unduly complicated. The schools are drawing income from no less than seven separate sources. My right hon. friend suggested that there should be only three elements—the standard grant, the grant in aid of buildings, and the grant to certain areas. To provide for these grants working within certain limits, he suggested that in some cases such as the deaf and epileptic schools there should be a limit on the amount provided by the State. These proposals I take almost as they stand. But we cannot say that the result of these proposals as he prophesied they would work out, will be exactly the same under this Bill, for the simple reason that we do not know how far contracting out will be taken advantage of, and until we know how far it will be taken advantage of we can make no definite prophecy as to the charge which will fall on the Exchequer a few years hence. There is only one other subject which I wish to mention at this stage, and that is the clause which deals with the religious instruction committee. The religious instruction committee provided for in this Bill is exactly similar to the old religious instruction committee of the London School Board and of nearly every big school board throughout the country, and certainly it is the best testimonial to the national commonsense that these old committees worked perfectly well, although there were sitting upon them very often at one and the same time strong Nonconformists, Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Socialists. I believe that the religious syllabus found in nearly every county borough in England, was drawn up by bodies exactly of that nature. I hope they will do their work equally well in the future as in the past. I have described one part of the process passed through in framing this Bill. The concessions made on one side amount to this: single-school parish schools become local education authority schools. Rent, but only a small rent, is paid to the trustees in return for the transfer. Teacherships are thrown open, and teachers are under the local education authority alone. The non-elective manager disappears. So far as the rate-aided schools are concerned they have given up rate-aid for denominational teaching. But this is a give-and-take Bill, and like every other compromise we have had to give something in return for what is taken. On our part we have been asked to agree to facilities being allowed everywhere. In the past we have fought the right of entry vigorously; but under the old conditions we were fighting what was then a mere act of grace. When my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, prior to the last General Election, made a speech with his usual vigour, against the right of entry, he made it against what was an act of grace for which absolutely nothing was given on the other side. The whole position has changed now. We are actually getting something on the other side. The thing was regarded with suspicion and disliked as upsetting the compromise of 1870. It was denounced because it was one-sided, and because it was in contravention of that compromise. We have now initiated a new compromise. For the first time right of entry is presented as part of a balanced agreement. The Church asks for facilities and gives up her peculiar monopoly of country schools. She says that she surrenders her special opportunity for instilling her own doctrines not only in children of Church parents but also in children of other denominations attending those schools. This, in our opinion, she rightly surrenders, and in return she gains for the first time the opportunity of securing to Church children whose parents desire it, in all schools, dogmatic teaching of her own faith by persons in whom she has confidence. That is a substantial gain, and I do not wonder that churchmen all over the country welcome this Bill as a great advance on anything they have obtained previously. It was only possible for us to give way on this because it did not involve any breach of principle, and because we have attached to it conditions which safeguard it from grave risks. We opposed it in the past because it was associated with very many risks of administrative confusion, which no one will better appreciate than the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. We also objected to it because it would preserve under the old system some form of tests for teachers. We now hope to avoid both those risks. Regulations will be made by the Board under Clause 2

They will be in the simplest form, designed to enable parents who desire special religious instruction for their children, to obtain it with the minimum of formality and delay. If the parent desires the child to receive special religious instruction not already provided by the authorities, the form of application will probably consist of a simple statement to be signed by him to the effect that he wishes that special religious instruction shall be given to his child in the doctrines of a certain church. The next question is during what hours are these facilities to be given. The main objection that has been taken is that the religious instruction comes within the school hours. I do not know whether that can be got rid of or not; I only know that the simplest way to proceed is to state definitely the time at which the religious teaching takes place. There cannot be facilities for all hours of the day; that would make mince-meat of the time-table. But no one objects to facilities being given between 9 and 9.45 every forenoon, or two forenoons a week. With reference to the problem whether it comes within the school hours, that will remain with the local authorities to say under what is now known by the phrase the "Anson bye-law." Then comes the question, To what children may denominational teaching be given under these facilities? Only to the children of those parents who express a desire for it. It would be preposterous for a parent to demand facilities for children with whom he had no concern. By whom is this religious instruction to be given? By volunteers. by outsiders if possible, and if by teachers, then by such teachers as are now in voluntary schools which will be transferred with them, or by existing assistant teachers in council schools. We have made one exception in the case of the head master, the head teacher, or the head mistress for this reason—that the duty of the head in all schools is impartially to arrange the religious as well as the other instruction. The denomination of the head is very apt to stamp the school with the character of that denomination as well as the teaching practised within that building. We therefore regarded that as a dangerous step. We have stood out against the heads of council schools being allowed to volunteer. The solitary exception to this relates to the head of a voluntary school who is transferred to another voluntary school, for a period of five years after the passing of the Bill. Subject to the permission of the local authority, he may volunteer to give religious instruction. There must be no test of the teacher on or after his appointment, nor inquiry about his volunteering. Payment for his services must be made not by the local education authority but direct to him. To avoid outside influence, we provide that the teacher's selection, appointment or promotion shall be effected not by local managers or outside persons, but by the local authorities. Public opinion may be unjust at particular times and on particular subjects, but on the whole, like the ventilation of a house, it keeps the air pure. I have no doubt that there will be many cases of oppression which might be sought out and publicly proclaimed by the National Union of Teachers. Of course, all facilities must be subject to administrative practicability. We cannot allow pandemonium in the schools, and discipline must be maintained. That it is possible within these limits to give *bona fide* facilities of wide and very great value to churchmen and others who care to take advantage of them, is the deliberate opinion of the Government. The obligation of the authorities to allow religious instruction to be given must of course be limited by the possibility of room being found for the purpose, and of the possibility of the teacher's being spared from his other duties. That can be arranged if the local authorities are reasonable beings, and we are to take for granted they are reasonable beings, or local government would break down. We have every hope that the local authorities will co-operate with the rest of us in avoiding denominational and religious friction. These proposals are of course opposed by the extremists. I do not for a single moment wish to say anything uncomplmentary about the extremists. Those on both sides who are quarrelling most fiercely about this settlement are the men who have taken a deep and keen interest in all educational administration during the last thirty years. But I must confess to drawing some crumb of comfort from the reading of my newspaper when I find in one and the same column that this settlement is denounced by Mr. Hirst Hollowell and Lord Halifax, and when I find that the Bishop of Manchester says that this is the Peace of Death, I would remind him of the motto above one of the doors of this building, *denique cœlum*, which some folks say means "Heaven at last." If our proposals do not find favour with the extremists, I hope they appeal to the common man in the street. It is the ordinary John Bull to whom we appeal. It is being said we are in a position of great power and we ought to have made no concession. Why not? Concession after all comes with a better grace and with a more salutary effect from superior power, and it establishes confidence on a solid foundation. Concessions which are made by both sides are those which compose this compromise; and indeed like all healthy compromises it can be very easily attacked. A man could pick twenty holes in the Bill in half an hour and the only thing that will make it work will be the good feeling of those who administer it. When I am told the scheme is not logical, I can reply that the House of Commons has always claimed the privilege of acting merely on the facts before it on the evident principles of compromise. And, as a matter of fact, much in this world must be taken for granted. We cannot always be arguing about first principles. If the scheme is not logical, my only reply is that men who would carry everything to its logical conclusion are very dangerous guides. The world is, after all, saved by bad logic and good feeling. This is a balanced settlement, and I hope there will be no attempt made to disturb its equilibrium. The settlement, after all brings very great advantages to education. During the short time I have been at the Board of Education I have discovered that certainly half the time of the most capable officials—in all but the technical branch which, fortunately, is free from any religious strife—is devoted to difficulties great and small which are constantly raised by religious controversy, and the Minister himself cannot give proper time and the best of his attention to the improvement of the educational system. He has to spend hours every day over the solution of religious squabbles and over problems which are not educational but merely sectarian, while local education authorities are in no better case. The attention of their members and of those who send them there is centred almost entirely on religious quarrels. That is the experience of those administrators with whom I have come in contact, and I am perfectly sure that those who compose the members of the local education authorities now will regard this settlement with gratitude, even if it throws considerable inconvenience upon them. I hope that, if this settlement goes through, one great advantage will accrue, and that is that the authorities will be able to arrange classes and schools of different types and curricula untrammelled by denominational considerations, which have often in the past interfered with the spontaneous action of the local authority. It is a remarkable fact that the three countries in the world which have the best educational systems—which we might well envy—Germany, America, and Scotland, have not one of them this religious strife. In America, which I am sorry to say in many respects is still far ahead of us in education, they have adopted a solution which would have satisfied everybody in this House, without any compromise whatever. I know we are bound to meet many different views. I can only present this compromise to the House in the hope that it will be considered in as generous a spirit as that in which it has been framed. I do so with no note of triumph. No one has been victorious. Nonconformists cannot and do not wish to trample on the Church. The Church, on the other hand, cannot crush the spirit of Nonconformity. We cherish hostility to no Church. The settlement is prompted far more by tolerance than by despair. It is marked by neither bigotry nor party spirit. It is an agreement in the true sense of the word, and by no means a victory. If it is affirmed by Parliament, I am sure of this, Parliament will have earned the gratitude of the villager, of the villager's child, of the child in the town, and of the administrators and of the teachers. On our side we may rest content that we have fulfilled our pledges to our constituents, while the Church, submitting to no confiscation of property, retains influence over her children in her own schools, and secures access to her children in council schools. Each side has made generous advances, each has given up some powers of exclusion, and each will be richer and stronger for the sacrifice.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

*Mr. HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) offered his congratulations on the personal success of the Minister for Education. They were very close political neighbours and had many constituents in common, and he shared their very deep and sincere admiration for his right hon. friend's ability and tact. He congratulated him that he had succeeded in gathering together so large a share of public opinion, and that he had been able to bring under his big umbrella so many men representing so many different types of thought. But he was inclined to think that this great manifestation towards peace which they were witnessing on all hands at the present time was rather an indication of the weariness of the flesh than of a sudden access of Christian charity. He should be very glad to take a part in securing peace, but he did not agree with much of the concluding portion of his right hon. friend's speech. He did not think education was absolutely at a standstill because different sects were warring. On the contrary, they had seen evidences that education had made many strides, because public opinion had been awakened and new interest had been aroused on account of recent controversy. His mind went back to the evening eighteen months ago when the Chief Secretary for Ireland introduced his Bill, and he was led to ask himself what kind of a reception he would have got had he made the same proposals then that were made now. Of course, he was told politically they had travelled a long way since that time. That might be perfectly true, but he had not travelled an inch of the way towards the conclusions which had been reached by his right hon. friend. They had been told as a result of the failure of the first Bill of the Government that a way would be found for the Commons' will to prevail, and he was led to ask whether this was the way which had been found. He supposed most of the suggestions which were made in another place in regard to that Bill had been adapted for this measure, and if this measure represented anybody's way it was not the way of the Commons, but a way expressed by the Lords some two years ago. He would suggest that this way of meeting the situation was an invitation to the Lords to go on treating the proposals of a Liberal Government with the same scant courtesy with which they treated the proposals of his right hon. friend a couple of years ago. He opposed the Education Bill in 1896, and other Bills in 1897, and he opposed the Act of 1902. He might have been right or wrong—only the future could tell—but he was quite sure that if he was right in opposing those Bills he was equally right in opposing this. The right hon. Gentleman told them that this was not the Bill of the Government, and that they themselves would not have made these proposals. But they must take the responsibility for them. If this great peace was to be secured and the Bill was a great success, they would, during the Christmas recess, have his hon. friends claiming every credit to the Government, because of the success they had achieved in bringing this matter to a compromise. He saw no objection to that, but if they were going to claim the credit they must take the responsibility. That was admitted. It was not that he wanted to seem in opposition to the Government, but he must be able to address his arguments as to a Bill for which they had made themselves responsible. His right hon. friend had spoken as one desiring to secure the interests of education, and to get rid of all extraneous difficulties. So far as he could see, the proposals of this Bill committed every sin that was possible in regard to the canons of good education, of good administration, of good local government, of unity in the school, and, as they used to hear, of co-ordination in regard to education. If he came to the conclusion that education itself was not going to be advanced, he did not see why they should be called upon to make great sacrifices of principle. The Bill must be taken as a whole. It was a compromise, and it would not be open to his hon. friends to secure any concessions of a serious nature. The answer they would always get would be that they had only made this concession because they had something in return from the other side, and they were bound honourably to carry out the bargain. His hon. friends could not vote for the Second Reading with mental reservations that they were not supporting certain provisions in it. Although they might make this compromise to-day there was no guarantee for the future. But how long would it be a settlement? There was a compromise in 1870, and he did not know how many Acts were passed between that year and the next Education Bill. An agitation was started in the interests of voluntary schools, and time after time they got safeguards removed. His opinion was that a compromise might be good to-day and for a year or two, but they would very soon find elements at work—in fact, they were already at work—to secure that the compromise should be extended, and should not be maintained intact. He would offer to this measure two tests. First of all, there was the old religious equality test. Would the effect of this Bill be to bring religious education, undenominational or denominational, in our schools more directly under the authority of the State or less? The second test he would apply was in regard to the measure of public control secured by the Bill. In regard to the first test this measure proposed, for the first time in their history, that religious instruction should be given by law in all the schools of the land. Religious education in the schools had been permissive since 1870 and now for the first time they had abandoned that position and were making religious instruction compulsory in the schools. That was a very serious departure.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The hon. Member forgets that there is a conscience clause.

*MR. HUTTON said of course there would be a conscience clause. The right hon. Gentleman was going to vote next session in favour of the disestablishment of the Church in Wales, but he was not obliged to attend that Church, and he was opposed to the establishment on grounds of religious equality. Now the Government were asking their supporters to vote for the same measure of establishment in regard to religious instruction in the schools of this country. The Government were indirectly if not directly responsible for the provision of denominational instruction as well as undenominational instruction. That was a serious departure from the principle of non-interference and neutrality they had so long respected. They were told that this provision would not be used, but he did not think that was a very honest argument. The right hon. Gentleman was making that concession to hon. Gentlemen opposite representing the Church of England, and it would certainly be made use of. There was no need for anybody to be deceived by the idea that this right of entry would not be made vigorous use of in all parts of the country. The Bishop of London had done his best to remove any doubt upon that point. In yesterday's *Times* there was a letter from the Bishop of London to the rural dean, and there was also a report of a speech made by the Bishop. In his letter to the rural dean the Bishop said—

> "It must be remembered that the number of Church children in council schools is probably greater by at least three to one than the children in the Church schools, who, after all our efforts, only number 102,000, and it is of great importance to be able to teach the whole Christian faith to so many more children."

That meant that it was of great importance to him to have the right of entry into the council schools where there were three times as many children as in the voluntary schools—

> "They would have (he said) to study its pros and cons very carefully, but one thing about it was like water to a thirsty man to his clergy in the suburbs. In some of those suburbs they had not got a single Church school, and the faithful clergy were like hounds in leash, straining to seize the chance that had come to them at last of reaching the Church children in the schools, and teaching them the Christian faith."

They had arrived at this position—that they were making proposals which were "like water to a thirsty man to his clergy," and were enabling these gentlemen, who were like hounds in leash straining to use this right of entry to teach their own children in council schools. Therefore, anyone who thought this right of entry was not going to be used extensively would be deluded, and he beseeched them to come to a different opinion. The Government had taken a very serious step in throwing open 9,000 board schools in the country to denominational teaching of all kinds. He regarded that as a disaster. Those 9,000 schools were the citadels of the State in regard to education, and they were now proposing to create a breach which would never be repaired, and they would not have the old state of things restored. For thirty years the Liberal Party had been striving to build up this national system and extend those schools, and they had been led to believe that here, at any rate, there was at least one set of schools where denominationalism had no place. The Government very rashly and disastrously were allowing in school hours the teaching of denominational creeds and catechism not altogether at the expense of the denominations. He had heard a great deal about mandates, but he might be allowed to state that he had never mentioned them throughout his political life. Much had been said about the right hon. Gentlemen in 1902, and there had also been a great deal said about the mandate of the Liberal Party with regard to tests and public control and the like. But after all, what had this talk come to? Simply a right of entry into council schools. He asked those Gentlemen who talked so much about mandates where was their mandate for passing this proposal? Let them go back to the year 1906 and see how many of his hon. friends, who were so glib about the pledges given at that time, would have been able to get comfortably through their public meetings without being severely heckled if they had declared that they had a mandate for opening 9,000 schools in the country to all the different denominations in the land.

*Mr. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): At every one of my meetings I put that before my constituents.

*Mr. HUTTON said that no doubt his hon. friend fully explained that the facilities would be inside school hours. Up to the present in the council schools there had been no ancient privileges, no vested interest, and no sanctified traditions. All those things were attached to the old denominational schools, but the council schools were kept clear of them. Now they were going to let in those very interests and privileges which they had gloried in keeping out so long, and when once they had a footing it would take a very long time indeed to clear the schools of that kind of denominational atmosphere. And this was being done not after a defeat at the poll but after a great party victory, and there was absolutely no demand for making such a tremendous concession as was proposed. Some of his hon. friends said that this provision would not be very diligently carried out. That was most important for two reasons. In the first place, the clergy to-day were a very active and keen race of men. They were much more active than they were thirty, forty, or fifty years ago and they were not likely to miss any opportunity that came their way. Beyond that the Government had taken this additional safeguard that the right of entry should be made use of. They had provided that the assistant teachers might volunteer and when the Government expressly said in an Act of Parliament that teachers "may" do something they would be expected to volunteer. The Bill provided that only the assistant teacher might volunteer, but why should the head teacher not be allowed also to volunteer? Why was he debarred from that privilege? Hon. Members opposite would be able to say that the Government having conceded this right to the assistant teachers they could not resist conceding it to the head teachers. There was no principle upon which they could differentiate in this matter, and he was sure they would have hon. Gentlemen opposite demanding that no difference should be made between one and the other. His right hon. friend said there were to be no denominational tests. He would put this case. There was a school where there were two or three teachers of which the head teacher would be debarred from giving denominational instruction, and there was a vacancy for an assistant teacher. Everybody knew that whoever was appointed, master or mistress, to that post he or she would be invited to volunteer to give religious instruction, Did not the right hon. Gentleman think that great pressure would be brought to bear upon them? Did his right hon. friend think that it was quite fair of a great Government to throw the obligation on those, many of them, young teachers to refuse the invitation which would be given to them by many of their own friends. Many of those teachers had been through the denominational training colleges, and there was not a single teacher who had been through those institutions who would not have been taught and trained to volunteer. Seventy-five per cent. of the teachers were ladies, and he should be very much surprised if a considerable section of them did not yield to the persuasive arguments which the clerical party would be able to bring upon them. He thought that after all that had been said on the matter it was a little too late to bring this pressure to bear on young teachers appointed, not only in Church of England schools, but in council schools as well. What kind of instruction was to be given? Who was going to say whether it was satisfactory or not? Was there going to be the right of inspection? Would they have the diocesan inspector going about the council schools to see whether the volunteer was teaching the catechism or the creed satisfactorily? He did not see how they could manage without it. After the teacher, came the inspector, and they were in for all the paraphernalia of denominational teaching in all the schools of the land, and all that was to be provided by Act of Parliament. The machinery of the State was to be used for all those opportunities which were to be provided. So much for the proposal in regard to the provision of religious instruction. It was a serious violation of his idea of the neutrality of the State in the matter of religious instruction. As to the matter of public control his right hon. friend told the House that he was going to eliminate all the things that were immaterial. One of the things he was going to eliminate was the school which was going to contract out. All these schools were supposed to be immaterial. Did not that reduce the question of public control to a farce. Under the Act of 1902 the Leader of the Opposition professed to give public control. It was only a skeleton and a pretence, but still there was something in it. It could have been vivified at any rate. But they were going to abandon the skeleton of control which they got under the Act of 1902. They were going back to the pre-1902 position in these denominational schools. Indeed, the position would be worse than before 1902. It was to be subject to a very large number of considerations. For instance there was a conscience clause which operated for the voluntary schools, but there was no conscience clause for the new contracted-out schools. They were to give the right of entry to county council schools, but there was to be no right of entry for anybody into the contracted-out schools. There would be no Kenyon-Slaney clause for the new contracted-out schools. They would appoint their own teachers and managers, and they would administer their own funds; they would have absolutely no check left upon them. He thought that was a very serious state of affairs. He believed that a large number of schools would contract-out. Not only were they to be far more free than under the 1902 Act, but they were to have, roughly speaking, 50 per cent. more money per child. When the denominational schools came into the State system they received 35s. 6d., and to-day they were to receive 50s. While increasing the grant to that extent, they were abandoning all the rights they had to-day, and they were not resuming the rights which they had before 1902. That was a serious state of things educationally. His right hon. friend had said that any child could claim that a school should be provided. The obligation should not be put on the child to claim a provided school. They all knew that parents sent young children to the nearest school. Would a mother send her young children to a distant school when there was one close at hand? That being so, they would not get parents to set up an agitation for new schools. The schools to which they would send their children would be in many cases contracted-out schools without even the safeguards which existed before 1902. Educationally that was an exceedingly dangerous position. But they were not going to remain there. They were threatened already with an agitation for more money and more concessions. The 50s. was not going to be sufficient. It would not be long before they had another "intolerable strain." The Leader of the Opposition was eagerly watching the swing of the pendulum and he was quite ready to resume office at the first opportunity. The right hon. Gentleman would not be unwilling to give one or two sessions to discussing the relative merits of Nonconformists and Churchmen. The right hon. Gentleman would rather do that than discuss the merits of Colonial preference and free trade. Then they would have all this old battle cheerfully brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman opposite on the first possible opportunity. Contracting-out was not only educationally unsound, but by providing for that they were seeking the same old trouble which they had gone through and inviting the old contests in an almost more furious form in the future than in the past. But he might be told that he had not taken into consideration the great advantages this Bill would bring. It was said they were going to have public control not only in the towns but in the village districts. In the first place, as there might not be much chance of amending the Bill in Committee, he wished to say that the definition of the single school district seemed to him to be a most unsatisfactory one. They were told that in all these schools they were to get public control. Was that an accurate statement? He thought things were going on for a considerable time pretty much as they stood at present. The existing headmaster was to continue in the same position as that in which he stood: he was to have the same rights, privileges, and duties, and he would go on teaching as he was doing for the rest of his tenure of office. What was his right hon. friend's estimate of the length of the average tenure of the present headmasters? He would say that it would extend to ten or fifteen years, that was to say, that in all those schools which they were going to capture the present state of things was to continue for ten or fifteen years in the villages. If that was the case, he did not see that they had got any advantages compared with the concessions which they had made. In the Church of England single school area schools there were 450,000 children, and in the council schools there were about 3,000,000 children. They were going to give to denominations the right to give religious instruction in the schools which had 3,000,000 children, and all that they were going to get by-and-bye was the right to appoint the headmasters in the schools which had 450,000 children. It seemed to him that was hardly worth speaking of as a bargain. They were simply perpetuating the state of things which existed at the present time. His objection to the Bill was not that he and his friends did not get all they wanted, but because it seemed to him that they positively lost ground. So far from making progress he thought they were going back. Even in the face of the great display of support which his right hon friend had for this Bill he asked the House to hesitate to pass the Second Reading. He viewed the proposals of the Bill with alarm, but he viewed the tendency of the measure with infinitely more alarm. It delivered the council schools up to denominational faction; it exposed teachers to all kinds of pressure; it provided a new opening for denominational schools to exist outside of the State system, and it again restored the old dual system. He deplored these proposals. He believed they would have a disastrous effect, and therefore he asked the House to reject the Bill. He begged to move.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) in seconding the Amendment, expressed regret that he found himself in opposition to the Government on this question. The Bill had been commended to the House in such a way as to suggest that this was the only possible way out of the educational difficulty for the Government. He for one had not taken the view from the beginning that the Government had dealt with the education question in anything like the way, in view of its importance and gravity, which they had a right to expect after what was said at the last election. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on his dialectical skill and on the manner in which he had dealt with the mandate of last election. As he understood the demand for a mandate at the last election—a demand which was approved of and supported by the leading Members of the Government—it was this:

That no Education Bill would be satisfactory which would not do away with tests for teachers, which did not give complete public control over all schools receiving public money, and which did not prohibit not denominational teaching at the expense of the rates but denominational teaching at the expense of public money. That, as he understood it, was the mandate of the country, and there were many passages in the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman and other Members of the Government which most conclusively showed that that was the case. But what had been the whole attitude of the Government on this question of education? Had there been, from the beginning, the slightest indication on their part that this difficulty was to be solved by them? They had played with the Education Department. One would have thought that in dealing with a great complex problem like education there would have been appointed at the head of that Department some one of great previous experience, and that the Government would have availed themselves of the services of Mr. Acland, who had had experience as a Minister of Education, or Lord Stanley of Alderley; or failing these two that they would have utilised the services of a person of great experience in education like the Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty. But two gentlemen had been appointed to that Department who had had no previous experience. One made an effort to grapple with the problem by an Education Bill which failed to pass, and he was then sent to Ireland. And the right hon. Member for Islington, having had a special experience in the Education Department, was removed. Then they had substituted as Chief Minister for Education the right hon. Gentleman who was now First Lord of the Admiralty, who had absolutely no previous experience in education, and whose qualification apparently was only a readiness in debate and the fact that on a certain occasion he was able to vanquish a stupid mind on so remote a question as the difference between leaf and stripped tobacco. Then that right hon. Gentleman was given as assistant; whom? The hon. Member who had now gone to the Foreign Office, but who had had experience in education. That hon. Gentleman was the Progressive leader in London at the moment when the whole Progressive cause in education was betrayed to the other side. He was followed by a gentleman who had had a few years experience on the Newcastle School Board, and he was accompanied by a gentleman who had shown great enthusiasm for education by advocating in certain literature the raising of the school age, but who had promptly repudiated it when he became a candidate for the Elland Division of Yorkshire. That was the way in which the Government had dealt with the education question; and now, when they found that, as they put it, the country was sick and tired of the controversy, they came forward with a proposal which meant the abandonment of every principle and the complete betrayal of everything which the Liberals had stood for on this question—the most cynical and flagrant betrayal of political principle which the House had witnessed in the annals of modern politics, and that was saying a good deal. But what relevancy had the fact that people were tired and weary of the question to this hurry-scurry attempt to scuttle in the direction of a scuttling settlement? The people of the country were sick and weary of Home Rule being discussed, but by the same token were the Liberal Party going to abandon Ireland? The people of the country were sick and weary of the controversy between tariff reform and free trade, but were the Government going to abandon free trade because of that? There were many other illustrations which might be used. He suggested that the people of the country were not so tired and weary, and not so sick of this controversy as they were that they had a Government of "Weary Willies and Tired Tims," who were anxious to get out of a difficulty by making the proposals they had done in this Bill. And what were these proposals? It had been somewhat maladroitly suggested—and he said this advisedly—by the right hon. Gentleman that this must be a good settlement, because the extremists on both sides were against it. Personally he had been represented as standing for the extreme Nonconformist view. He stood for no such view. He left that view to be represented by those lay leaders of Nonconformity in this House who were plain "Misters" a few months ago but now revelled in the title of "Sir." He stood for the plain man in the street, for keeping the peoples' schools clear from all the influences of the parsons and priests of any denomination—either Anglican, Roman Catholic, or Nonconformist. He had not been against compromise. He believed he was the only Welsh candidate at the last general election who advocated compromise and that generous treatment should be extended to the denominational schools. But it was never contemplated then, nor was it now, that in any scheme of compromise there should come into the area of these negotiations anything with regard to council schools. It was suggested that this was a compromise that was fair to all parties; but what did they get with regard to the denominational schools? They got not public control in every single school area, but merely public control in every rural school area. But there were a large number of urban single school areas. Take the case of Radnorshire, where he himself went to school. There was only a single school there and that was an urban school. It might not be transferred and it might be one of the contracting-out schools. Take the place where they had had many of their Welsh Conventions with regard to this education question—Llandrindod Wells. There was only one school there and it was an urban district, and the school might not be transferred and might be contracted-out. Where, then, did they get public control in all single school areas? His second point was this: it was said that denominational teaching was taken off the rates, and his third was, that it was alleged that there were no tests for teachers. Now, first of all, denominational teaching was not by this Bill to be taken off the rates. What was taken off the rates was the cost of the salary of the teacher who might give the denominational teaching. As a matter of fact—some hon. Members might never have heard of it—the Birmingham School Board had for years given a right of entry to the denominations outside school hours, and the Board had a scale by which they charged 5s. per room per day in every school to the denomination using it for denominational teaching. But in this Bill it was clearly stated that the denominationalists were to have the use of the school buildings and denominational teaching in school hours free of rent, heated, cleansed and lighted, all at the expense of the rates. Then, it was said that they were abolishing tests for teachers. A more absurd, a more futile suggestion in the face of the actual provisions of the Bill could not have proceeded from those benches. They had one of the strongest and most conspicuous cases in this country on the matter of tests for teachers and that was the case of the greatest of all the school boards—the School Board of London—a publicly-elected body limited for religious teaching to Cowper-Templeism. One of the greatest educational election contests ever seen in this country took place in 1894 for the London School Board, and with what object? For the purpose of getting rid of religious tests for teachers. And what did the test for teachers consist of? It merely consisted of a circular which was issued to the teachers in this form—

> "If there are those among you who cannot conscientiously impart Bible instruction in this spirit, means will be taken, without prejudice to their position under the Board, to release them from the duty of giving the Bible lesson. The religious opinion of candidates will not, in any sense, influence their appointment or promotion, nor are they to be subjected to any questions with reference to their religious belief."

On paper, could there be more conclusive proof than that against the idea that there was any religious test involved? But in practice what happened? Out of hundreds of teachers with full qualifications, who declined to give religious teaching there was only one single case of a teacher being promoted to a headmastership, and not a single case of promotion to a head-mistress-ship; but in the case of those teachers who volunteered to give the religious teaching in accordance with the terms of the circular, promotion followed, although their qualifications were less than those who refused to give the religious teaching. That was the beginning of the whole of this trouble. When they defeated the particular section known as the Rileyite section on the London School Board, what did they say?

They said they would transfer their activities to a wider sphere, and from that day to this they had been working, through the Education Department and Parliament, to get carried into effect throughout the country those particular things for which they had worked on the London School Board. He said, without hesitation, that if they were going to put this position to the Council teachers, that some might volunteer and that some might not, and that they were to put up for election in the event of a vacancy, they had an actual test. Everyone knew perfectly well what would happen. Take a case which might happen even in so great a place as London. What would be likely to happen here? Under the present scheme of the London County Council they had for every group of schools in London what was called a board of managers. These boards of managers made a selection of three teachers for every vacancy, and these three names were sent up to the London Education Authority, who selected one to come before them. What was the fact? As a result of the last county council election, wherever Progressive, or Radical, or Nonconformist members of these boards of managers could be removed by the London Education Authority they were in fact removed, and at this moment they had not a single board of managers under the London education authority which did not consist of a majority of members of the Church of England or Roman Catholics. He had heard that the leopard had changed its spots, and that clericalism was not going to work in the future as it had done in the past, but there were some of the boards of managers at this moment consisting of an actual majority of ordained priests. This being so, say a person applied and got the position of assistant teacher in one of the London boroughs. There were say, two teachers; one declined to volunteer to give religious instruction, and the other offered to give it according to the Catechism of the Church of England. It was not in human nature that it would not follow automatically as a matter of course, that the members of the Church of England upon the nominating and appointing committee would work for all they were worth to secure the appointment of that person who belonged to their denomination, and who had volunteered. Lest he should be understood as speaking with some bias as against either Roman Catholics or members of the Church of England, he would go frankly to the position as it now obtained in Wales. There they had their educational authorities overwhelmingly Nonconformist, in some cases overwhelmingly consisting of a particular denomination of Nonconformity. Did anybody suggest that in the ordinary course of things precisely the same thing was not going to happen there? He simply said that for Parliament, by imposing upon these bodies possibilities of this kind of temptation, to let teachers run the risk was not what Parliament ought to do. Then it was suggested, and it was a most cowardly suggestion, but the Press of the country had been primed with it, that if in fact this victimising of the teacher did take place, and if in fact there was this favouritism, there was no suggestion that the Board of Education should come down and exercise disciplinary powers and stop it, but that the teacher must join his or her trade union of the National Union of Teachers in order to get redress. That had never been suggested in the case of Post Office or dockyard officials, and why it was suggested in the case of what was now going to be a body of Civil servants, he did not know. Besides, the National Union of Teachers had its membership among teachers who were fully certificated, and there were 100,000 teachers in the country who were not certificated, and, of course, for the most part those embraced the very assistant teachers, the very young teachers, upon whom this test might be put, and who might be open to the temptation that he had suggested. If this unfortunate Bill should ever get beyond this House he hoped that steps would be taken to see that that possibility at all events was avoided. Those were the things which they were supposed to have obtained, but what had they given in return? They had abandoned the whole position of the Liberal Party argumentatively against the establishment of a State Church. They had at one swoop by this proposal wiped out the whole of the traditions of the Liberationists from 1840 down to now. He endorsed everything that had been said by the hon. Member who moved this Amendment. Only yesterday he went to a meeting of the Welsh Parliamentary Party and implored them, in the face of what was likely to happen next year by the introduction of a Disestablishment Bill, that they would give pause before they lent support to this Bill which cut from under their feet absolutely every argument in principle with which they would have to come to the House and ask for disestablishment next year. For the first time in the history of this country it was proposed to make religious instruction in the schools compulsory. This was a Bill for the establishment and endowment of denominational religion in the council schools and to the extent of contracting-out for the establishment and endowment of denominational religion in the contracting-out schools. The position upon which they of the Liberal and Nonconformist Party had hitherto stood—the position which was reiterated again and again against the compromise in 1870 was this, that it was not within the proper function of the State to teach religion to adults in the Church and that it was not within the proper function of the State to teach religion to the infants in the schools. The right of entry by which they were to get this denominationalism in council schools was a right of entry during school hours. That was not a new proposal, although it was new from a Liberal Government. It was a proposal which was denounced by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer in terms which justified his asking him to come out—to leave the Government and to fight with them against this monstrous Bill. The language that he had used was perhaps so strong that by Members who were not familiar with the particular words of the right hon. Gentleman, his attitude might perhaps be misunderstood, so he would read the actual words addressed to his constituents. This was what the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, and he regretted that he was not in his place to deal with the point—

> "They, the Church party, were asking for a right of entry within school hours. He wished to say Nonconformists and Liberals were not going to grant it. If this were proposed, whether by a Conservative or Liberal Government, he desired it to be distinctly understood that he would be in opposition. They might wake up any day and find that they had been given away, and he wished it to be clearly recognised that the party or party leader who would give away the Nonconformists on this question would have to count on their most strenuous opposition in the carrying out of such policy."

As the right hon. Gentleman said, they had been given away, and those who had given them away would have to count on their most strenuous opposition. This right of entry was not a new proposal in itself. Fourteen years ago it was known as the Orpington plan. It was suggested by the then Vicar ot Orpington, and well he recollected how vehemently the papers denounced the proposal. He recollected how adroitly "F. C. G." drew cartoons showing the effect of a large number of different denominations making applications for denominational teaching in one of the council schools. They had pictures drawn, which it did not require a great stretch of imagination to realise to-day, of a large number of denominational pens in the main hall of one of the large board schools. One of these pens was labelled "Wesleyan," another "Roman Catholic," and another "Church of England," etc., and then in the midst was a picture of a child that was being claimed by the Baptists, Roman Catholics, Church of England and by representatives of other bodies as belonging to their particular faith. That was a condition of things which, metaphorically speaking, if not physically, would constantly happen under the new *regime* which would demoralise the whole discipline of school and do much to destroy that delightful *esprit de corps*, which was the well-spring and life of the school, and to antagonise childhood at a time when it ought not to be antagonised. But it was not merely that the right of entry was given. To his mind the most fraudulent part of this Bill was the line as between contracting-out on the one side and alleged public control on the other.

What was the position? The only schools which must contract out were those in single school rural parishes. All the other denominational schools might or might not contract out just as they liked. The question as to whether the Liberals and Nonconformists got much under this Bill, in the way of extended public control, depended entirely upon the extent to which contracting out would be resorted to. What was the position? The contracting out schools were being given 50 per cent. more by way of grant than hitherto. It was notorious that before the Bill of 1902, introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, the cost per scholar of the different voluntary schools was as follows:—Church schools, £2 4s. 11d.; Wesleyan schools, £2 3s. 4d.; Roman Catholic, £2 3s. 1d.; British and other undenominational schools, £2 8s. 11d. That was the cost per child in those schools upon the rates prior to the Act of the right hon. Gentleman passed in 1902. That was taking the whole country, taking the rural with the urban, and what he contended was that with £2 10s. coming in the denomination would be able, if he might say so, to scheme a surplus and use it elsewhere. There seemed to have been such an alacrity on the part of the Liberal Members to get rid of this question that there were some aspects of the Bill which had not yet been frankly put before the country. The right hon. Gentleman, in 1897, introduced a Bill for which he was roundly denounced by Members on that side of the House, and that was the Voluntary Schools Aid Act. No language was strong enough to denounce the proposal that there should be a 5s. dole per child in the voluntary schools, but the right hon. Gentleman safeguarded the giving of that dole by saying that while it was to go to the Associations of Voluntary Schools, it was in fact to be allocated and distributed by the Board of Education in consultation with those associations. Further than that, the right hon. Gentleman was indifferent as to whether it went to a denominational association like the National Schools Society, or to an undenominational association like the British Schools Association. But what did this Bill propose? It proposed that no money at all should go to an association of voluntary schools that did not belong to a denomination, so that the British Schools Association was left outside. It then proposed that £2 10s. or thereabouts per child was to go by way of grant to the contracted out schools; but what was to happen? There was to be one single association for each denomination over the whole of England and Wales. In other words, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster's committee would have handed over to them by the Liberal Government a sum of £700,000 of the taxpayers' money each year to be applied and distributed in the unfettered discretion of that body so long as it went to elementary education. It was an abrogation of the financial powers and privileges of this House. There would be a sum, roughly speaking, of £3,500,000 handed over by the Government to the Archbishop of Canterbury's committee, to be applied and distributed in whatever way they liked, subject only to the condition that it must go to elementary education. One knew perfectly well what would happen. That money would be collected and pooled and used for the purpose of opening new schools as against the council schools. This proposal to give, unfettered and unshackled, in a lump sum, to a single denomination, these vast sums was as a knife held to the throat of the council schools, and would render futile the suggestion that they were securing educational peace. It was said that religious teaching was to be made compulsory, that they were to have a new sort of Council of Trent in every district. They would have a Council of Burton-on-Trent in all probability to settle what should be the particular form of religion. Here was a Liberal Government proposing a piece of machinery, claiming to be democratic, suggesting that the persons who might do the mischief should electively be two removes away from the electors. In other words, the whole thing with regard to religion was to be settled by non-elective committees, appointed by, but not necessarily of, the education authority. The education authority, as they all knew, was nominated by the county council, partially consisting of county councillors and town councillors, and partially of outsiders, so that if they got any mischief done, or any feelings outraged, by this religious committee, they must go to the county council, with a view to changing the education authority, with a view to changing the religious committee. The whole thing was fantastic, absurd, and undemocratic to a degree. They were told that this was a compromise, and that it made for a settlement. They were told that something must be done to save the educational reputation of the Government. He thought they had been excessively unwise in proposing this particular something. The difficulties which would be created by this Bill if it became law would be a hundredfold greater than the difficulty which existed at present. There was a great deal of thunder and lightning in the discussions, and there had been for the last few years on this religious wrangle, but after all, what had happened? The Liberals had fired at the Tories, the Baptists had fired at the Roman Catholics, the Church of England parson had fired at the Wesleyan, pulpits had been fired against pulpits, platforms had been fired against platforms, while inside the school there had been not a single sign or semblance of any real religious difficulty. If they passed this Bill into law, what were they going to do? They were going to send the fighting sects, the local leaders of denominations, the warriors of theology, into the very midst of the schools. They were therefore going to bring the religious difficulty inside the schools, and not merely the denominational schools but the council schools also. He said that that was a crime against the democracy of this country. It was the most wicked thing that had been attempted by any Government against the peoples' schools, and if he had to cut the whole of his political connection, if the Liberal Government had to be sacrificed, then ten thousand times better that they should be sacrificed rather than that the people's schools should be handed over to the proselytising priests of all denominations.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): I do not approach this Bill from the point of view of either of the two last speakers. I am in favour of a settlement, but a settlement honourable to both parties. They had another anxiety. They were anxious lest in the settlement arrived at, one of the parties should really get all that he thinks he is getting under the arrangement. I have a similar anxiety. I am not sure that under this arrangement the schools in which I am interested—the Church in which I am interested—will get all the Bill professes to give. I am bound to admit that this Bill is conceived in a very different spirit to its predecessors. As to the demerits of those predecessors I will say nothing. They lie like autumn leaves around the feet of the Government, and, like autumn leaves, I must sweep them away. But this Bill does contain a compromise. It contains a genuine compromise in so far as each party gives up something which he values. I do not think that either side should minimise the sacrifices which the other is called upon to make, and is indeed making. The sacrifice that we are asked for is undoubted and serious. We are asked to surrender the Church schools, the Church schools which at one time were the sole provision for elementary education in the country, the Church schools which in the course of their career have saved hundreds of thousands of pounds to the taxpayers and the ratepayers, schools which have been built, improved, and enlarged on a Parliamentary guarantee that they would always be used for the purposes for which they were built. We are asked to sacrifice these schools in order to meet a grievance which the hon. Member who has just sat down assures us is absolutely unreal, a grievance confined to the platform and to the pulpit, and non-existent in the schools. I did not agree with much of his speech, but I do cordially agree with that particular portion of it. There is no doubt as to the reality of this portion of the Bill. The local authority is no longer to maintain a school which is not provided by itself. The terms are as explicit in the clause as they can be made. I do not propose to touch upon the conditions of transfer now; there is something to be said about them in the Committee stage. I am quite ready to admit that the concessions on the other side are in point of principle considerable. The right of entry involves an invasion of the Cowper-Temple clause which I know is very near to the heart of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the importance of which I recognise as making for peace. The use of the teacher, limited and guarded as it is, is a matter to which I know hon. Gentlemen opposite attach much importance, and in regard to their admission of the contracting-out principle they appear to throw aside, for the benefit of the settlement, almost every educational principle that they have ever laid down. But there is this curious feature about this proposed settlement. We have been privileged from the letters which appeared in yesterday's papers to see not only the result of the negotiations, but the progress of the negotiations themselves. We have read the letters which passed between the Archbishop and the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education. What I am concerned to inquire is, whether the letter of the Bill carries out the spirit of the negotiations. I must touch on some matters in which I think the Bill falls short in this respect. The hon. Member for Morley dwelt at some length on the immense concessions involved in the right of entry. He described how the ministers of denominational religion would have access to the schools, the influence that they would there exercise, and the disaster to undenominationalism which would everywhere result. I am not quite so sure that the Bill as it stands has the effect which the hon. Member fears. The Archbishop stipulated for "full and effective opportunity in all schools during school hours for giving denominational religious teaching." Have we got it? I notice for one thing that whereas the desire of the parent for undenominational religious teaching may be expressed in any way the parent chooses, as regards denominational teaching his desire must be expressed under conditions and in the form provided and regulated by the Board of Education. I do not quite understand why this difference should exist. Some parents have a conscientious objection to undenominational religious teaching, and why should there not be just as serious provision to meet this objection as there is in regard to denominational teaching? And then I am compelled to ask—Can we trust the Board of Education? I am bound to confess that we have had indications during the last eighteen months that the Board of Education, although entrusted with judicial functions, does not always discharge those functions in a judicial spirit, and we cannot repose that confidence in the Board of Education which we ought to be able to repose in a Government Department. There is another matter which the right hon. Gentleman touched upon. The Archbishop stipulates that religious instruction should be given during school hours. I notice, however, that whereas the undenominational instruction is to be given in the first three-quarters of an hour of the school's meeting, the denominational teaching is to be given between 9 and 9.45 a.m. If this means that it may be pushed out of school hours by some arrangement about the marking of registers, it is worthless. Everybody knows that in dealing with the matter the local authority could so alter the time table as practically to exclude denominational religious teaching from the school hours. We know that proposals have been made in former times by way of adjustment to give religious instruction at times which were not within the school hours, and if the difference between the two sections in phraseology is a real difference, and the intention is to exclude denominational religious teaching from school hours, then I say that the Archbishop's stipulations are not observed, and for my own part I will not accept religious teaching given under those conditions as any satisfaction of the promise made. Then the local authority has to decide whether any and what accommodation is available in the school house for religious teaching. Everyone knows that hostile local authorities can make things uncomfortable for voluntary schools, and "schoolhouse" is a term of wide meaning. I have some anxiety lest in some parts of the country no accommodation should be found available in the school building, and lest the teaching may be relegated to some spare bedroom in the teacher's house or to some shed in the playground. That might be a way of meeting the requirements of the clause, but I do not think that it would be a fair way of meeting the spirit of the undertaking which has been given. Then, again, the local education authority have to decide whether they can spare the teacher consistently with the conduct and discipline of the school. I find that there are many ways in which the local authorities may put difficulties in the way of this religious teaching. I gather that one of the difficulties which occurred in the course of the negotiations, and which was only got over after they had continued for some time, was as to the question of local option in regard to the right of entry—whether they were to allow the local authority to determine if there was to be the right of entry or not, and the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education, I understand, gave way on that point. I think the drafting of the Bill, and the hurry with which it has necessarily been prepared, may have something to do with it, but I should hardly think that the right hon. Gentleman means that local option over areas, which was withdrawn from local authorities, is to be revived in respect of each individual school. Taking the individual school, they might say that they could not find room, or could not find a teacher to give religious teaching here and there, and in that way the giving of denominational religious teaching might be rendered practically inoperative. I do not accuse the right hon. Gentleman of bad faith in this matter, but I do point out to him the result of the phraseology of the clause, and that it does not to my mind carry out the terms of the negotiations.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what language he has in his mind?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Clause 3, which says that the local authority shall provide any accommodation which in the "school-house" can be easily made available for denominational instruction. As the Government knows, the term "school-house" is very wide; it means a great deal more than the actual school buildings, and the question whether a place can be easily made available rests with the local authority. In the same way as regards the teacher, in the next subsection, the service of the teacher shall not be withheld by the local authority—

"Unless the local authority has satisfied the Board of Education that the services of the teacher are required for the general conduct of the school."

MR. ASQUITH: The point I am asking about is with regard to the particular school when the right of entry might be refused.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: My point is this. Although local option was annulled in regard to the area, it might as the Bill is worded, be revived in respect of each individual school, and so we should get back to the original condition of things. Unless the right of entry is genuine there is no consideration for that great surrender which we are to make. Then there follows the contracting-out, which I should have thought was equally unacceptable to both sides of the House. Contracting out violates the principle of popular control. Contracting out admits tests of any severity to be imposed on the teacher. Contracting out practically is a frank endowment of denominational education as plain and obvious as the endowment of the Roman Catholic University, without all the silly make-believe with which we amused ourselves of forbidding tests, chapels, and other things wholly immaterial in respect to the practical result of the measure. As a matter of principle, I should have thought that hon. Gentlemen opposite would have strongly objected to contracting-out. Educationally, I regard contracting-out as retrograde, partly because it defeats the aims which we put before us—co-ordination in local areas—by the withdrawal of the contracting-out school from the authority of the local education committee, and because financially it will be difficult to keep these schools, on the terms given in the Bill, even as they now stand, up to the average and capacity for progress of the other school. I note that these terms are final, and that, although the education may become more costly and other schools may be more largely assisted out of the rates, no provision is made by way of a sliding scale for an increase of the grants to these schools. Consequently, these schools, disadvantageous as would be their present position under the Bill compared with other schools, five years hence may be in a state so backward and exhausted that the whole situation will have to be revised. If I thought that this was the last word of the Government on these provisions I should oppose the Bill at this stage. But the Prime Minister the other day said to my noble friend the Member for the Chichester division, in answer to a question, that this matter might be reconsidered in Committee, and I do earnestly hope that during the Committee stage, short as will be the time allowed for the consideration of the measure, some better mode may be found of dealing with what I may call homogeneous schools in which the entire child population is of one religion, and no danger or inconvenience would be caused to anybody by recognition of that fact. Now I come to the points in the Bill which appeal to me. I feel strongly that a great deal is gained by the provision of religious instruction within these schools by the necessary setting apart of three-quarters of an hour of the school day for religious instruction for all those whose parents desire it. I also attach a great deal of importance to the introduction of this committee of religious instruction whose duties I should like to see extended not merely to the preparation of a syllabus but to the control and management of the mode in which the teaching is given. But as the Bill stands I feel that this provision raises this sort of teaching above the level of what the Leader of the Opposition has very aptly described as municipal Christianity. It takes this syllabus outside purely local control and entrusts it to bodies of various religious denominations who will enter seriously upon their inquiries, I hope with excellent results. Then the introduction of the right of entry does to my mind import this on the part of the leaders of my Church that they recognise a responsibility for the children in the council schools as they have recognised responsibility in the past for the children in the Church schools. I was glad to hear the hon. Member for the Morley division expatiate on the energy and success with which denominational religious teaching would be given under the right of entry. Many doubts and anxieties have been expressed as to whether the right of entry is worth anything. From my point of view the right of entry will be worth whatever the Church chooses to make of it. I have that confidence in the members of the Church to which I belong to believe that they will not allow this opportunity to pass by them of securing that the Church children in the Council schools should have that teaching which will make them understand that they are members of a community up to whose standard of religious life they must endeavour to live. I should like to press upon those who think this right of entry is worth little, this consideration, that the voluntary schools are diminishing in number, that the council schools now provide accommodation for the greater number of the children in school attendance, that new schools are relatively few in number. If you look at the yearly statistics of the Board of Education you see some Church schools closed, some transferred, and comparatively few new schools built. I should not like to lose the opportunity of getting access to the Church children in the Council schools which is offered by this Bill. My own desire as regards this religious question has always been that Christain teaching should be available for every child and special religious teaching for every child whose parents desire it, and the Bill with its many defects moves in this direction. So far as my own attitude to the Bill is concerned, much must depend on what happens during the next few days. I speak only for myself I will be no party to an unreal settlement nor to a settlement which leaves any large section of the community in a position financially and educationally deplorable. But I see a hope, however faint, I see a chance, though it may be remote, of an honourable settlement of this question which has for so many years hampered our educational system and embittered our religious and political divisions. I know it is impossible to go any way in this matter without differing from friends whose opinion one regards, and yet that hope, however faint, I will not relinquish, and that chance, however remote, I will not forego, and with this hope in my heart I propose with all reservations to vote for the Second Reading.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he rose thus early in the debate because he had been asked by his colleagues to state the Catholic view. He recognised at a very early date that this was a measure which would have behind it an amount of strength which was not at the disposal of any previous Minister for Education. Indeed, if he were disposed to comment upon the ironies of politics he would certainly have abundant opportunity in some incidents even of this debate, apart altogether from the provisions of the Bill. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the success which he had attained, a success largely due to his own skill, and at the same time he felt inclined to contrast his position and his fortunes with those of the Chief Secretary for Ireland when endeavouring to make a settlement of this education question. He could not help making the comment that if the same consideration had been given to the Chief Secretary's Bill as was properly given to this the former Bill might now have been on the Statute-book, and in his opinion that Bill was from every point of view, from the point of view of religious liberty and still more from the point of view of educational efficiency, a far better settlement, at least from the Catholic point of view, than this. He knew the Bill would have a great deal of force behind it, partly because of the stage of exhaustion which this controversy had reached, but still more because when they came to the compromise in English politics they came on a racial instinct against which it was almost impossible for any man—especially a man of a logical mind—to make any successful attack. So far as the settlement between the contending creeds and parties of this country was concerned he had nothing to say. He would welcome any peace among them which was accepted by all or most sections of opinion. His business was with this Bill as it affected the particular communion which he represented. From that point of view the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman was a slight improvement on the Bill of the First Lord of the Admiralty, but except for that it was as bad a settlement from their point of view as any that could be proposed. The settlement was bad for these reasons. He was not a Member of the Liberal Party, but there was no man in that House who held more strongly what he regarded as the essential principles of Liberalism, and he was entitled to test the Bill from that point of view. Secondly, he had always approached the question as one which ought to be regarded largely, if not supremely, from the educational point of view, and the demand from that point of view was even stricter in the case of a man in his position for the reason that he represented a particular class of the community which was least able to pay for education and at the same time was most in need of it. He did not claim to speak to any degree for English Catholics. The noble Lord on the front Opposition bench was in a much better position to do that. He dared say the noble Lord would make some ironical reflections also on the finance of the Bill as compared with the Bill of the Chief Secretary. But if the noble Lord and his friends could have induced themselves to support the Bill of the Chief Secretary in its ultimate shape they would not be face to face now with an inferior settlement of the question. He personally examined the Bill from the point of view of Liberal principles. The hon. Member for Morley represented views with which he found it far more difficult to quarrel than with the right hon. Gentleman's statement. The hon. Member was frankly in favour of the secular solution. He (Mr. O'Connor) did not think the secular solution was one which any Government could propose in the present state of opinion in this country. He did not know that the state of opinion would ever come when the secular solution would be accepted, and certainly any Minister who would propose any such solution at that moment would wreck both himself and his proposals. At the same time the secular solution had one great thing to be said in its favour. He would not say it was logical, because that apparently was rather a term of opprobrium to apply to any proposal in the House. He said it was good because it was consistent and it was fair all round. It established no form of religious teaching of one communion over another, it excluded with equal justice and with absolute equality every form whatever of religious instruction, and if Protestants were willing to accept that exclusion

Catholics could make no particular complaint: they got no worse treatment than any other body. But was that the description of the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman? What was the proposal with regard to religious instruction? Religious instruction was now made practically universal, practically compulsory, and practically of one type. He knew, of course, there was a conscience clause and certain forms of local option committees that might frame one kind of syllabus or another, but these were minor distinctions. The broad fact was that in every public elementary school in this country supported out of taxes and rates there would be practically the same form of religious instruction. Some people had gone the length already of describing this as a new form of religious establishment. The seconder of the Amendment asked with some force and logic how could he be asked next year to vote for disestablishment in Wales when his own friends were establishing a new form of religious creed in the schools of the country. The President of the Board of Education would be entitled to reply that this was not sectarianism because it did not answer to what he and his friends regarded as sectarian. He had tried to find a definition of sectarianism as understood by the right hon. Gentleman and those with whom he acted. He found that it did not exclude all forms of religious teaching. According to the Nonconformist definition religious teaching should cover all the common principles of all Protestant communions. That was a fair definition. Furthermore, sectarianism was objected to by the party opposite when the doctrines of any particular religion were taught by the ministers of that communion to the children of that body and other communions as well. Let him apply that fair definition to this Bill. Could the Catholic schools be brought under the definition of sectarian? A Catholic school was homogeneous and it was not Protestant. It did not teach its Catholic doctrines to other children than Catholic. There were some Protestant children in Catholic schools, but by this Bill Catholic schools were almost invited to exclude Protestant children from their teaching. Although there were Protestant children in Catholic schools there had never been one authenticated case of a Protestant child being proselytised in a Catholic school. For a moment he would apply the definition he had given of sectarianism to the teaching which the right hon. Gentleman's Bill would make the universal practice. It might be unsectarian between Protestant and Nonconformist, but he declined to regard it as unsectarian as between Protestant and Catholic. In introducing a previous Bill the right hon. Gentleman said that what the country wanted was a Protestant settlement in a Protestant land. When the right hon. Gentleman established in those schools what he described as unsectarian Christianity he was bound to admit in candour that it was sectarian from the Catholic point of view. What position did they come to? That what a Catholic regarded as sectarian teaching was being established in all the public schools of the country, and those schools were being supported out of the rates and taxes. The Protestant Nonconformist passive resister preferred to go to jail rather than to pay 1d. towards what he regarded as sectarian teaching, and if there was one form of that teaching which he declined to support it was the sectarian teaching in the Catholic schools. That point of view had been summed up in a not very happy or courteous phrase, "Rome on the rates." Unfortunately Rome was on the rates, for he had never found that his rates were not demanded, and the same applied to the other members of the communion to which he belonged. He was bound to pay his rates, including the school rate, for the teaching of that form of Protestant doctrine which was as much proselytism to him as the most prominent doctrine of any single one of the Protestant communities. He could if he wished make quotation after quotation containing strong statements made by Welsh Nonconformists in favour of this view. There was a notable speech made by one of the hon. Members from Wales at a previous stage of this educational controversy. It was made by the hon. Member for Carmarthen, who said that if the Nonconformists once gave up the doctrine that the State should have nothing to do with religion whatever or any form of religious teaching; if it gave up that doctrine and accepted Cowper-Templeism, or any other form of doctrine like that, they had no logical answer to the Catholic that his religious teaching had the same right to use the rates and taxes. That was the result of his examination of the question from the point of view of what he conceived to be Liberal principles. He would approach the question now from what, after all, was the strongest ground, and that was the educational point of view. Was there a single man in any part of the House who would say that the contracted-out school could ever be in a position of equality with a public school? Was there a single hon. Member opposite who would make that proposition? Could a school with a grant minus the use of the rates ever approach to the same educational level as a school which had the grant plus the rates? When he came to educational efficiency, that covered a large field. He would begin with the teachers. It was a remarkable fact in regard to contracting-out that not a single teacher or teachers' organisation in the world had ever said a word in favour of it. He could quote speech after speech on this matter, and he was not going to quote the speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty, although it was a very powerful one, and perhaps the hon. Member would repeat it himself.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Dr. MACNAMARA, Camberwell, N.) said perhaps the hon. Member would forgive him when he said that notwithstanding those views the hon. Member voted for contracting-out when it was moved by the hon. Member for Preston.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said he would answer that by an observation once made by the Leader of the Opposition who, on being asked whether he preferred to be hanged or drowned, said he preferred to be drowned, although he had no great desire to be drowned. He would like to make a quotation from a speech made by the President of the Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers, held at Hastings, in which he said—

> "This provision for contracting-out is about the worst possible solution that could been have found. It is dead against the best educational interests of the children who will be taught in contracted-out schools; if such a provision should ever become law it would deal the severest blow to the progress of popular education which it is possible to conceive, and it is diametrically opposed to our fundamental proposition that every child of the State has a claim to the provision by the State of equal opportunities for secular education."

What would happen? This was educational retrogression, and that retrogression was made more intolerable because it followed a period of educational progress. Before the Act of 1902 Catholic schoolmasters were wretchedly paid, and were in a vastly inferior position to the teachers all over the country. They had got out of that land of bondage, and the Government were now proposing to put them back again. In obedience to pressure from the Education Department nearly all the fabrics of the Catholic schools had been revolutionised. He remembered very well the state of these schools before the Act of 1902. There were several Catholic schools in the Scotland division of Liverpool, and he was constantly being appealed to in regard to the decisions of Mr. Acland, who was then Minister of Education. One of the complaints which he used to bring before Mr. Acland was in regard to alterations in the size of the schools. The school inspector had pointed out that there were seventy or eighty children cooped up in a small hall and taught by one teacher. The demand of the education authority was that there should be more than one teacher, and that there should be two or three halls instead of one. Mr. Acland used to say: "How can you honestly ask me not to insist on these reforms in schools in the Scotland division?" He had no answer but that the people in his division were dockers, and others with precarious occupations and small wages, and that they had to equip these schools out of their small resources. There were many parts of the Act of 1902 which he condemned at the time and still condemned, but he asked the House to note the dilemma in which these schools were to be placed six years after the passing of the measure. The fabrics of the schools had been got out of their inefficient conditions, and now they were to be put back——

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Have you forgotten the increased grants?

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said the hon. Member might allow him to make his speech. There was no power on earth by which a school with a grant but minus rate aid could be put in a position other than one of educational inferiority. If they had in London a few years ago a Catholic school with, say, eighty children and one teacher in one room, they had now two or three teachers, and three or four rooms. That school would be put back under the proposals in this Bill. The Catholic school was to be no longer a part of the national system of the country. Catholics, who always demanded to be put on the national system, were to be excluded from it. He thought they were perfectly entitled to ask that their religious convictions should be respected and that their schools should be admitted to the national system. They did not want the schools, because they were Catholic, to be removed from the atmosphere sentiment. It was possible for one to be strongly denominational without being a bigot, and if Catholics were excluded from the national sentiment, they were excluded from one of the most beneficent influences in the system of education. This was not the time to go into details in regard to the increase of the grant; they would do so on the Committee stage. If the calculations given to him were sound, they proved that Catholics would lose £35,000 a year in London and £130,000 a year in the country. He knew the right hon. Gentleman disputed that, but it was a matter which would be discussed at a later stage. But if that was true, was not that an answer to the hon. Member for Salford, who asked if he had forgotten the grants? What was the use of an increased grant, if it left them in a position of inferiority or did not remove the inferiority? As had been stated, the whole tendency in connection with education had been to increase expenditure. He did not find fault with that; he admired and approved of it. He thought the more money they spent on education the better it would be for the nation. Therefore, the tendency in the public schools would be to increase expenditure, and as the expenditure increased the wider would be the chasm between them and the contracted-out schools. The whole tendency of the Bill, therefore, if it became law in its present form, would be to make the inferiority of the Catholic schools more marked. On what class of the community was this badge of inferiority to come? It was to come on the class which could least afford to be so treated. The Irish Catholic people in this country were engaged in the most drudgery, ill-paid, and unhealthy occupations, but they were to get less for education, he supposed, than the people of other races and creeds. That was not the whole grievance. These people. who would not get a penny of rate aid from their schools because of their sectarian Catholic teaching. would be compelled to contribute to the rate-aided schools which were Protestant. He spoke with some feeling on this question. It was among the Irish of England, Scotland and Wales that his political life had been spent. It was on their behalf that he made an appeal to this House—the tragic figures of Irishmen cast without trained minds and hands on the shores of this country, condemned to live in slums and alleys, and to work in chemical works, at gas retorts, and at docks. He was glad that the Government had declared that this Bill was not their last word on the question. He hoped, to use the language of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, that the means of goodwill and toleration all round would yet be found by which the Catholic school could form part of the national settlement, and that it would be put in a position of educational equality instead of inferiority. The right hon. Gentleman described his Bill a few months ago as a Protestant settlement demanded by a Protestant nation. It was a Protestant settlement mainly asked by a Protestant land, but in describing it as a Protestant settlement he gave it, from the Catholic point of view, both its epitome and its condemnation.

*Sir GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said the hon. Member for the Scotland division always presented his case in the most able and most liberal way in which it could be presented—perhaps more liberally than some of the other representatives of his Church might present it. He had always felt that in this Protestant country the Catholic case was an extremely difficult one to deal with if justice was to be done all round. The demand was made that they should have Catholic schools for Catholic children, taught by Catholic teachers, at the public expense. He submitted that that demand could not in that form be met by a community such as that for which an Education Bill like this provided. Therefore he was not disposed to follow his hon. friend in the pathetic appeal he made with so much power. At the same time he was bound to point out that when he claimed that his Church had been worse used in connection with the principle of contracting out than other Churches, he had enunciated a statement for which there was no ground. It seemed to him that when the principle of contracting out was adopted by either the Anglican or the Catholic Church, both Churches would be treated on an equal basis. It was a question of finance which could be better debated in Committee, and, therefore, he did not propose to follow the argument which the hon. Member had put before the House. Whatever the opinions they might hold in regard to this Bill, he thought the House was to be congratulated upon the able manner in which the opposition to it had been presented by his hon. friend the Member for the Morley division. The House had the advantage of hearing from him the best that could be said on behalf of those who opposed the measure. He wished he could compliment the seconder in the same way, but the gross extravagances in which he indulged, and the innuendoes he threw out, really vitiated the good points in his argument. The hon. Member said he had the greatest pain in opposing the Government, but it seemed to him as the hon. Member progressed that he was in a state of great happiness and delight in being able to oppose the Bill. He himself had to ask the indulgence of the House, because he had to occupy a position somewhat foreign to that which he usually occupied on this question. It had not been natural to him to be a party to, or to help forward, compromises. He confessed that it would be at this moment more congenial to his natural man to stand side by side with his hon. friend the Member for the Morley division and those who were vigorously attacking the Bill. It would not only be more congenial, but it would be a great deal easier for him to take that position. [OPPOSITION cheers]. Yes, for the simple reason that it was always very much easier to pull down than to build. But, after thirty-five years of public educational work he had reached certain conclusions, and one of these was that he should never get his ideal except by instalments. He accepted this Bill because it brought him nearer, though only to a small degree, to his ideal as to education, but as a citizen he could not find in it the basis of a final settlement. It was evident from what was said by the mover and seconder of the Amendment that they had made great concessions. As he listened to those speeches he thought that they would do a great deal to convert Members opposite to support the Government on this occasion, for he ventured to say that no stronger speeches against the Bill would be made than those. They had to make concessions in the interests of education. He differed very seriously from the statement that no advance had been made in favour of education in this Bill. But in the interests of peace in the country and in this House they tried to agree to some settlement which did not vitiate the principles to which he, and those who agreed with him, had a life-long attachment. To whatever charge of inconsistency which might be levelled against him his answer was that in supporting this Bill he would be serving the interests of the children, and through the children the nation at large. As he had said, it was much more easy to break down than to build up; and if by any combination of votes in this House the Amendment could be carried, and his hon. friend the Member for Morley were placed in the position of Minister for Education which his great talents fitted him to occupy, and if he were to bring in a Bill based on his ideal of education, he appealed to him with his experience of the House whether he could pass such a Bill even here, to say nothing of the reception it would meet with in another place. Even the withdrawn Bill might be opposed on much the same grounds as this Bill was opposed by the hon. Gentleman.

But in that event, not an inch would be moved as a result of the attitude which his hon. friends had taken. That was the situation in which they were placed; and which they had to face. Did his hon. friends think that he liked the situation? Far from it, he did not like to stand where he did. [OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear."] He must be frank with the House. He did not like to stand in that place and advocate the passing of a measure which contained some things with the principle of which he totally disagreed. He was not there to defend the Bill *per se*, but he was prepared to defend it, or most of it, as what he might call an emergency proposal for securing what he thought were the immediate demands for a settlement of the education question. He had friends who were quite willing to admit the principle of compromise, but the moment they were asked what they were willing to concede, it was found that they would concede nothing whatever that was of any value to the other side. Holding that principle one should not enter into a compromise at all; but when once he admitted that the situation was such as demanded an earnest consideration for a compromise he must admit that he must concede something which he was unwilling to give up, but which he gave up only because he considered the interests at stake were greater than the things which he was willing to concede. He was not sacrificing any fundamental principle. He was not a peace-at-any-price man. There were unfortunately many in the House, and thousands outside it, who were willing to settle this question on any terms in order to get rid of it; but he affirmed what had often been affirmed before, that there were some defeats more honourable than victories. He had been in a minority before, and therefore if he felt that the proposals in this Bill were as disastrous as had been described by his hon. friends, he would be compelled to vote against the Government, much as he respected their action in this matter. But he examined the position from a totally different standpoint from that taken by the mover and seconder of the Amendment. He started with the belief that an agreement was possible, and that if it were possible, then it was wise under the circumstance to make that agreement. His hon. friends started with an ideal Bill in their minds, which would contain all that they believed was necessary for a national system of education, and they demanded that such a Bill should be presented by the Government to which they were attached. Having that ideal Bill in their minds they contrasted it with that of the Government, and found in the latter may defects and grievous errors. That was the ground of their opposition to it; they must have their own Bill or nothing. His hon. friend the Member for Morley had spoken of the old Nonconformist position on this matter. What was it? Up to 1870, the Nonconformists took the position that education should not be undertaken by the State; because religion was an essential part of education, and as the State could not, in their judgment, lawfully give religious instruction, therefore the State could not give education at all. That was the principle firmly held by the old Nonconformists. But circumstances were too strong for the principle. They found that by adhering to that principle thousands and tens of thousands of children were growing up in the grossest ignorance, and therefore, they had to forego their choicest and dearest principle in order to save the State from the enormous amount of ignorance that was growing up in and around it. He asked his friends who took the position which they did to-day to consider that the circumstances now were somewhat analogous to those in 1870. They might and could demonstrate that their position was logical, but he contended that as before 1870 the circumstances were too strong for the logical position of the old Nonconformists, so the circumstances of to-day were too strong for the logical position of his hon. friends. They ignored the existence of a large number of Church schools, and they also ignored the influence of the power in another place to prevent any real system of national education becoming law. He did not say that an idealist was always inadmissable. As an irresponsible citizen it was delightful to hear what he said. He influenced the public mind, and to a certain extent the mind of the Government. Therefore he rejoiced that there were idealists amongst them. He found no fault with the idealist at all; he had occupied that position himself many a time; but he was not a statesman, or expected to be called one. However, they could not have legislation such as his hon. friends desired, and, therefore, they must take the nearest obtainable approach to it as they could get, by accepting an agreed scheme such as was now before them. They must regard the interests of the children of the nation as paramount in this matter; and if they could get this religious question, as he believed they could largely, out of the way by this compromise they should all rejoice. It was only because of their pessimistic views that his hon. friends were led to take up the position they had done that day. What would they get under this arrangement? They got all the schools transferred to the various local authorities. His hon. friends had often discoursed about the value of free rural schools; he regarded the freeing of the rural schools as one of the greatest and most essential features of this Bill, as it was one of the features of the withdrawn Bill. The clergy had to a large extent regarded these rural schools as part of their Church work, and therefore they had taken control in their administration. That had often grated on the consciences and the happiness of those who lived in rural districts. He was not throwing a stone at the clergy for that, because from their point of view they were justified. But now that the nation paid the expenses of the schools, these schools could not exist any longer in their old condition. The late Archbishop of Canterbury saw further on this question than any of his colleagues when he declared that rate aid for these schools would ultimately bring them under public control. Therefore, while it might be said, on the one hand, that they were falling in with Lord Salisbury's dictum, and allowing the schools to be captured by the Church, there was another side to the question, and that was that they were now under this Bill evolving the prophecy of the late Archbishop of Canterbury when he said that to transfer the payments for these schools so that they came out of the rates must ultimately result in complete local control. He would remind those who were deeply interested in the rural districts of one or two consequences that followed these schools coming under local control. They had objected to Nonconformists being kept off the teaching staff of the schools, but now all teachers were to be appointed by the local authority, and consequently the Nonconformists would stand, for the first time in those districts, on the same footing as the Anglican or the members of any other Church. Village shopkeepers, and others, therefore, who looked to school teaching as one of the avenues for their children would, without any difficulty, be able to have that avenue opened. The county council would have complete control of these schools, and there would be in all of them, as he understood it, simple Bible-teaching on all days of the week, with denominational teaching for those children whose parents required it. They would therefore have, for the first time, the whole of the elementary schools in this nation, except the contracted-out schools, placed upon one footing, and that, he believed, was one of the conditions that the Leader of the Opposition said he was always anxious to see secured. Then there was the appointment of all the teachers, which, surely, was a great advantage. They had argued again and again that for any denominational body of people to appoint teachers, for which the people of the country had to pay, was an anomaly which ought to be abolished. It was abolished from this time, and after this Bill passed they would have no rates for denominational teaching. This was one of the recommendations, he said most unhesitatingly, which induced him to support this Bill. He knew the passive resister had been laughed at, and he would be laughed at again, but he also knew that there were thousands of poor ministers in this country who had been passive resisters from the first, and had paid their last shilling to discharge the claim which was made upon them through a Police Court, who would not receive financial assistance in their troubles and would go on passively resisting while the present Act remained in force. Whatever might be their principles, he said that these men deserved consideration at the hands of legislators, because, while perhaps 100,000 had been passive resisters, there were many more thousands of men who had believed in the same principle, if they had not seen their way to defend it on the same lines. His hon. friends had not attempted to show how the pledges for which they voted at the general election were violated by this Bill. He contended that when he claimed to be a supporter of popular control, of the abolition of tests, and the prevention of denominational teaching being paid out of the rates—he contended that they had secured those three things by this Bill, and if they had, surely something had been gained. He knew his hon. friends had laboured to show that a great deal more had been given than had been gained, but when both sides were charged with having sold the pass, as, in fact, they were charged in connection with this measure, there must be some confusion somewhere, and he would leave those who charged both sides with having sold the pass to settle it between themselves. It had been attempted to be shown that they had given everything, and got nothing. That depended upon which side of the shield they cared to look at. He could understand a state submitting the adjustment of its frontiers to arbitration, and on one side of the country they relinquished their hold upon thirty square miles of territory, and on the other side they got sixty square miles. Of course, if they only looked at what was going on the one side they might say that a great tactical stretch of country had been abandoned, and great advantages given away. That was because they simply looked at the one side and not the other, and when his hon. friends replied that that was nothing at all, the rights belonged to them before the arbitration began, he submitted that when one went to arbitration, they had to consider things as they stood at the moment, and could not put in any predetermined rights in order to establish their claim to a greater share of the spoil. What he felt was that if they argued as might be argued that they had gained everything and given up nothing, then they set an example of cupidity to the other side. Each side in the interests of peace had conceded what was necessary and nothing more than was necessary to get this compromise through, and he thought it could be shown that the party for which he stood had given some things which were a very great advantage to the other side, but still they were things about which no great principle was concerned. He thought they had done what was right and just, and he was sure that those who had carried on the negotiations for the other side had acted in the same spirit. It was regarded as a very serious question that the right of entry had been conceded, but that depended very largely upon the way in which it was conceded, and the spirit in which it was used. He thought the spirit in which this concession was going to be used very largely depended upon whether it was going to be a permanent part of the settlement. Of course, there were some things in the Bill which he had not seen or known, and for which perhaps the draftsman might be responsible. There were one or two things which he did not fully understand, but he was content to wait until they got closer in discussion of the details of this Bill in Committee. They included the way in which the Cowper-Temple teaching was arranged, which he thought was likely to be misunderstood, as he understood it, that teaching was to go on practically as it did in all the schools at the present moment. Then the question of regulations as to parents might well have a little more elucidation, and the question of fees was another matter, though it was not a matter of principle, upon which he should like to have some fresh light. Something ought also to be said on the power to apply the new contracting-out clause. Following the example of the right hon. Gentleman opposite the late President of the Board of Education, might he give a final word of caution to his friends. He hoped that they would all feel that the principles of this agreement must be adhered to, and that no attempts must be made, either here or elsewhere, to enlarge those principles upon any points which they might relatively consider essential to the settlement. Some of them had it on their consciences—

he used the expression cautiously, because he knew what the Nonconformist conscience was considered to be by some hon. Gentlemen—but they had had their consciences considerably on the rack, in regard to some of the proposals which had been conceded to the other side, and, therefore, when he said that the utmost limits of concession had been conceded by those for whom he had the honour to speak, he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would understand him. If they were to have war at any time, he would rather have war with a foreign Power than he would have a civil war in his own community, and he spoke with all seriousness when he said it would be a great misfortune if any attempt were made to enlarge this settlement on any essential principles. He would point out, in conclusion, that those who were opposing this Bill did so because they desired a secular solution. [Cries of "No."] He was speaking for his own side of this House, and he also thought that members of the Labour Party believed that the secular solution was the only one in regard to this question. He noticed that the very loud cheers which his right hon. friend the Member for Islington gave during the speeches of the mover and seconder showed that he concurred in all that they expressed.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Not in favour of secularism.

*Sir GEORGE WHITE said he did not mean in favour of secularism, but in regard to other matters, but he could not forget the great assiduity with which his right hon. friend tried to convert him and others to the views which were expressed in another place in regard to the Bill of the Chief Secretary, and although he could get up and charge him with inconsistency, he could remind him that that was a game that they could both play at, for if he was seduced from the paths of virtue on that occasion, the right hon. Gentleman was one of the chief agents in bringing that about. He had received the testimony of men largely engaged in the administration of education, and they had given a large amount of encouragement, and that had more than counterbalanced the letters of other kinds that he had received from some of his closest friends. But, whatever the result of this controversy, he should feel that he had taken his present position in what he regarded as the interests of peace and for the dismissal of strife. Remembering that the Bill was opposed by those who believed in secular education, he wanted to ask those Gentlemen to define what they meant by secular education, because he had no doubt he would agree with a great many of them. He desired no religious teaching in the school but such as was got from the simple reading of the Bible, which he believed to be a Book of Divine origin, and he thought it should be its own witness in the schools. Therefore, he had no doubt that with a large number of so-called secularists he was at one, but he felt that the position was one that now merited a reasonable conference to see whether there were not some terms of agreement. He believed those terms had been found on a fair basis. He had had many more congenial tasks in his lifetime, but never one which he was more satisfied that a sense of duty called him to fulfil. He should make no complaint of those friends of his who had taken an antagonistic view to his own, but he appealed to them not to aggravate the situation by exaggeration such as was indulged in by the hon. Member who seconded the Amendment. He need only refer to one remark, when he said that the Archbishop of Canterbury would have £3,500,000 to distribute if the Bill became law. Nothing could be further from the truth. That was not the way in which to arrive at a conclusion. If hon. Members desired to prevent the Bill passing, he did not think that that was the way either, for a well-reasoned speech like that of the hon. Member for Morley carried much more conviction.

*Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he was reminded by the debate of an old legal story. A certain judge was sitting with two learned brethren who differed from one another and he contented himself by saying that he agreed with his learned brother on the right for the reasons given by his learned brother on the left. He found himself inclined to follow the conclusions of the hon. Member for Morley, being largely moved thereto by the arguments of the hon. Member for Norfolk, who took, much more nearly than the hon. Member for Morley, the view of the effect of the Bill which seemed to him to be accurate. The Bill had been recommended to them as a treaty of peace, and hon. Members who had spoken all professed to be in favour of peace. Certainly he was. There was no one in the House who, for personal as well as political grounds, was more in favour of peace than he was. But when he was asked to support the Bill on the ground that it was to be a treaty of peace, he found it rather difficult to accept that conforting belief when he reflected that it was violently opposed by the National Union of Teachers, by a large section of the Nonconformists, he believed by the Jewish community, and chiefly and particularly by his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. That fact alone would make it impossible for him to support this measure. He did not think he would be justified as a Member of Parliament in voting for any measure which the Roman Catholic community said, with every appearance of reason, offended their conscientious convictions. He did not assent to one observation of the hon. Member for the Scotland division, viz., that the failure of the 1906 Bill was due to the action of the English Roman Catholics. That appeared to him to be a travesty of history.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: That was one of the factors.

*LORD R. CECIL said the real and immediate cause was the action of the Liberal Government in declining to consider the Amendments of the House of Lords. This Bill had many aspects, but he did not propose to say anything, for instance, about the money provisions, the provisions for the rent of schools. They were, of course, quite inadequate from his point of view, and he admitted that he looked with some anxiety to the position in which he and others would be placed, who had recommended people to spend in the last two or three years large sums of money in order to meet the requirements of the Education Department, and who would now have to tell them that, by the action of Parliament, they would get about a fifth or a sixth of the money they had expended. He understood that that did not trouble the episcopal conscience, but the working of the episcopal mind he confessed he had some difficulty in following. Nor did he propose to say anything about the curious provisions in one of the clauses of the Bill establishing a religious instruction committee. He understood that that was a thing which could be done at present, and as far as he could see it was either absolutely superfluous or, if it was going to force a committee upon a local authority and compel them to send to a committee, it might be of contending divines, all their proposals for religious instruction, then he thought it was not only superfluous but pernicious. He desired to come to what seemed to him to be the real question to consider, and that was: what security was there that denominational teaching would continue to be an integral part of the education of this country? He knew that hon. Members opposite regarded that as a merely sectarian question. They were entitled to their opinion; but it was not his. He did not regard the maintenance of denominational teaching as important in any degree because it would favour this or that Church. He did not believe that it did so, and he did not care about it if it did. That was not his object. In his judgment, it was futile to expect that they could have any real chance of preserving Christian teaching—real, effective Christian teaching—except through the medium of a denomination. He asked the House to consider whether it had ever been done in the whole eighteen or nineteen centuries of Christianity. Was there any instance that had ever occurred of effective Christian teaching that had not been connected with some religious body? It was quite clear that in dealing with the schools there must be some. What chance was there that a boy would continue to be a definite and sincere and active Christian, unless he had become allied to some religious body or another? It seemed to him to be a question whether they wished to make Christian teaching a part of their education or not. If so, surely they must teach Christianity effectively. Therefore, he denied that this was in any important sense a sectarian question. It was a religious question. They constantly heard it said that they should get rid of this question and go back to the true interests of education. That was an antithesis which he rejected with all the emphasis that he could. It was an absurdity to put the religious and educational questions as in opposition to one another. Their education was absolutely valueless, from the point of view, he believed, of the enormous majority of the people of this country, unless it was founded upon religion, and to say that they could get rid of the religious question and go back to the true interests of education, was to misunderstand the issue before them. Holding those views, he had to consider what was the theory on which this Bill was based. It had been stated with great frankness by the Minister for Education, who said that the normal religious teaching was to be undenominational, that denominational teaching was intended to be exceptional, and he was not sure that he might not add, although the right hon. Gentleman did not say so, temporary. He thought that according to the scheme of the Bill, it was also to be temporary.

MR. RUNCIMAN: There is no intention of that kind in the Bill at all. The bargain is to be a permanent bargain.

LORD R. CECIL said he did not mean to say that the right hon. Gentleman contemplated an amending Act, but when he considered all the provisions which applied only to existing voluntary schools, for instance, and when he took the single instance which only allowed the existing voluntary school head teacher to give religious teaching and put a limit of five years even to that permission, then he thought the idea of the Bill seemed to be that the denominational teaching was to be an excrescence which was gradually to diminish and eventually to disappear. When they came to look at the machinery by which it was proposed to be kept alive, they had first of all the contracting-out. He was quite content to take the view of the Minister for Education, who said that they had got to provide for those who conscientiously desired a denominational school. Therefore, though they were not entitled to kill them altogether, they seemed to think there was nothing wrong in slowly starving them. This attitude reminded him a good deal of the old view that the Ecclesiastical Courts were not entitled to execute because they were not allowed to shed blood, though they could order persons to be burned to death. He thought they were entitled to ask what kind of equality was provided for the denominational as compared with the undenominational teaching. There was no equality of payment; there was not to be equality of choice; the children were to get undenominational teaching unless they specially demanded denominational. Therefore, it was clear that all the children were to have undenominational teaching. It was only if their parents were sufficiently conversant with the terms of the Act to know the steps to be taken, and if they took those steps, that the children would get denominational teaching. That was really the vital part of the whole Bill. It was useless to make provisions of this kind unless they also made provisions for the schools having adequate staffs. They did not get any head teachers in the denominational council schools and only got them temporarily in the voluntary schools. He would be very much surprised if that was regarded as a satisfactory arrangement. What did that mean? It meant that the head teacher was debarred from giving that instruction which the assistant teachers would be allowed to impart. Was it in accordance with human nature to suppose that the head teacher would be in favour of any form of teaching being given which he was unable to give? Of course, he would not. He would discourage it in every way he could. Nor had they any right to any assistant teachers. It depended on whether they volunteered. They had no means of securing their appointment; nor had they any security that there would be any teachers who were qualified to give the teaching. It was one of the chief claims of the promoters of the Bill that there was to be no test of the qualifications of teachers who were to give this denominational teaching. He did not see how it was possible for them to imagine or hope that denominational teaching on those terms was going to be effective, or such as would really give the children the teaching to which they were entitled. One aspect of the Bill to which he wished to call attention was what, but for the speech of the Minister, he would call the studied ambiguity of its terms. It was very difficult to say what it was that was granted and what it was that was withheld. One could not help feeling that, as the hon. Member for Morley had said, the supporters of the Government justified the Bill to the Nonconformists by saying that it was true that there was right of entry, but they need not bother about it, because the conditions were such that it would never be exercised. And then they went to the Archbishop of Canterbury and other excellent prelates who had been in negotiation about this matter, and said: "The whole of the principles you contend for are in the Bill, but we must impose some conditions in the interests of administrative efficiency." In other words, the principles had been granted to the Church, but conditions had been put upon them which Nonconformists were asked to believe would render those principles ineffective. That appeared to him, he did not wish to exaggerate, to be the effect of the provisions of this Bill. How could a Bill of that description possibly make for peace? The hon Member for Morley had remarked, quite correctly, that if the Bill became law, the Church of England would make a great effort. She would be bound conscientiously to make a great effort in order that the facilities might be made effective to secure denominational teaching. She would make an enormous effort in that direction. What a commentary on that they had from the hon. Member for Norfolk, who said it was absurd that Nonconformists should expect to get all they wished for at a step, but that this at any rate was an instalment of what they wanted. And Dr. Clifford had put the matter even more clearly. He said the question was: "Did this measure, taken as a whole, carry them really nearer to a system of education generally national"; and "that that idea could not be reached at a bound; nobody could expect it." That was the prospect of peace which lay before them. The militant Nonconformists regarded this as merely a step forward in the direction they desired to go; and it was these very gentlemen who said at the same time, and with great truth, that it would be the duty of the Church to press such privileges as were left to her to the utmost, if they were possibly to be made effective. They had only to look at the Bill to see that so far from being a means of bringing about peace, it would introduce religious strife, not only into Parliamentary elections but into every election throughout the country. The education authorities were given administrative control, and they were to allow the services of the assistant teachers if they could be spared from their other duties. The obvious course of those who desired these facilities was to fight every local election in the country on strictly sectarian grounds. He did not understand why this Bill was supposed to make for peace. They asked for nothing except equality; they asked for no privilege. They felt that the settlement of 1870 had broken down, and they felt that their demand must be met on a basis of logic and justice. He believed there was no practical difficulty in carrying out such a settlement. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty was fond of saying that to give free play to the principle that each parent might demand for his child teaching in the religion he chose would produce pandemonium in the schools. The hon. Gentleman could not say that any more, because the principle had been conceded in the present Bill. He had been at some trouble in the course of the last few months to investigate the working out of the day industrial school system in regard to the rights of parents to require that their children should be taught in their faith. No difficulty had been experienced. There was an industrial school in Drury Lane where some sixty Church of England, some thirty Roman Catholics, and a comparatively small number of children of other denomnations were provided with religious instruction according to their wants. This was done without difficulty. That was the experience, not of a single school, but of some fifteen other schools in the country dealing with 1,500 children. It was one of the arguments on the other side that this system split the children up into groups, and they would not associate with one another. He had inquired of the master of the school in Drury Lane whether this was the fact, and he declared that there was no truth whatever in the statement, but that, on the contrary, the boys made friendships which endured through the whole of their lives, while the *esprit de corps* of the school was complete. They asked for religious equality; they asked the Government to carry out that principle which the hon. Member for North West Ham, at that time in a position of greater freedom and less responsibility, said to the House he was obliged to support. This was what he said—

"As I understand the local authority in Scotland can decide to give religious teaching in conformity with the desires of the people of the locality. That is not offered by this Bill. The people are allowed to choose religion if they like, but only one form of religion. If they wish to choose another they must pay for it. That is playing with loaded dice. It is only the religion endowed by the State that is to be free. I do not know, but I do not think that the majority of the Members of this House went to their constituents and asked them to record their votes in favour of this particular religion being taught universally in the schools. I admit that in my innocence I exhibited 'religious equality' in my posters. I shall have hereafter to explain that that was a terminological inexactitude."

He did not quote these words of the hon. Gentleman with any desire to attack him. He was sure the hon. Member was perfectly sincere when he made those observations, and if he was able to support this Bill it was because he was convinced in some mysterious way that it did confer religious equality. Why should the House not grant this religious equality? What possible ground of Liberalism was there which could justify the House in elevating one particular form of religious instruction above another, and making that form the established and endowed religion in the State schools?

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said that whatever might be the case in the industrial schools, he would do his best to prevent any such departure in the case of the council schools. On the general question of the Bill he had to say that this was not the Bill which his constituency sent him to support, and he had not the least hesitation in condemning it and refusing to support it. He objected entirely to the conditions of some parts of it, and he objected to it as a whole. It was not a Liberal Bill; it was not a measure calculated to carry out the principle which Nonconformists held dear. It was not for him to be more Royalist than the King, and if the Liberal Government and the Member for Norfolk could give this measure their support on what were supposed to be Liberal and Nonconformist grounds, he must leave them to settle that for themselves. He preferred to go on and deal with the matter on other grounds entirely. He had heard with great interest the speech of the Minister for Education. He complimented him upon it. It was clear, fair, and conspicuously sincere, though mistaken as he thought. There were perhaps two statements in it to which he should take exception on points of fact. He heard the right hon. Gentleman say that most of the time of the officers in the Board of Education was occupied with difficulties arising out of these theological disputes. That might be so in the case of the political heads of the Departments, but so far as he knew, and he had known the Department for many years, it was not the case with regard to the permanent staff.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The hon. Member will allow me to express some view about my own staff. I assure him that half the time of the capable heads of the Department, with the exception of the technical branch, is taken up with matters which arise out of the religious question.

*MR. YOXALL said he was surprised to hear it. He had not been in the Department in the capacity of his right hon. friend, but he had known it for many years, and he should have thought it an error to state that anything like half the time of the heads of the Department was taken up with difficulties arising out of theological disputes. The fact did not coincide with the other statement to which he took exception, and that was that the members of education committees and local administrative bodies all over the country found themselves hampered to the extent mentioned by this religious difficulty. In the councils everywhere there was no religious difficulty. He believed it was the case in, he might almost say all the education committees under county and county councils, that peace now existed. Why were they going to have the opposite of peace introduced into the work of the council schools and education committees? He wished he could transport the House to what would be the state of a council school if this Bill became law. There was to be a right of entry between nine o'clock and quarter to ten on two mornings per week. At nine o'clock, as a rule, school assembled, and the register was marked for the first time. Then came the hymn, and then the prayer. About a quarter past nine the Bible lesson began. That was the state of things now. It appeared, however, that not only were they to have in the council schools a right of entry, different lessons on religion by different teachers, but different hymns, and different prayers in different class-rooms. That was in the name of peace. If peace did not now exist he would consent to a great deal to bring about peace. But peace did exist there, and this Bill was not going to bring peace but a sword. This was no olive branch. This was no method of improving the condition of the school. That right of entry would be carried out, he did not doubt in the least. The churches would take care of that, and they would destroy what peace now existed. They would bring enmity and discord where there was now peace, and for what gain? There would be no educational gain resulting from this change. What political gain would there be? Would Ministers satisfy their friends in the country by this Bill? When the general election came round their case would be far worse if this Bill became law than if they had introduced no Bill at all. His feeling was that it sacrificed to political expediency and Parliamentary emergency the present peace and the present rate of progress of the schools. Right of entry was not compatible with administrative convenience and with peace in the schools. It involved separation of children who were not separated now. It set up at the youngest age—it might be three years of age in the infant classes — distinctions and differences which the children did not, and could not, understand. They would not know why they were classified here and there, and taught different doctrines and formulæ and catechisms by different teachers. They would know that in this class-room the crucifix was hung on the wall while the lesson was being given, and the symbol of the bleeding heart could be worshipped during the lesson, while in the next room instruction that that was blasphemy would be given by the representative of some ultra-Protestant organisation. This in the council school which had represented hitherto what Liberalism and Nonconformity held dear, brought about as a result of the Bill of a Liberal Government! Had that Government which sat on those benches three years ago dared to bring forward a Bill of this kind there would not only have been passive resistance but there would have been a revolution in the land. For ten years they had had the demand for the right of entry. It had always been opposed until recently by those with whom he associated politically. He had never before known the principle conceded. To this was now added as a further concession, amplifying it and rendering it real and vital and permanent, the permission given to paid teachers in the council schools to volunteer to give the kind of teaching which was provided for under the right of entry. The head teacher was not allowed to voluteer, but it was not so much a matter of the head teacher. He was in this particular nothing like so important as the assistant. The head teachers were much fewer than the assistants, and administrative difficulties entirely apart from theological opinion would in the case of nearly every school make it impracticable for the head teacher to volunteer, no matter how much he might wish, even if he were permitted to do so. He supposed it would be most unfair of anybody to object to an assistant teacher volunteering to give this instruction if the volunteer were motived by a sincere desire to teach the religion.

But they mixed in all sorts of incentives and invitations and indirect bribes of a mercenary kind. The noble Lord said the Church of England would make a great effort to make the right of entry a real thing. He supposed that effort would consist largely of an endeavour to obtain the entrance of the clergy—the superior clergy, the vicar or rector, the curate, a lay reader or some worthy earnest layman—to go into the schools. That was tried in Birmingham for many years. It did not fail all at once. It went on for a very long period—for nearly thirty years. Some of his hon. friends consoled themselves with the idea that it would break down and that the teachers would help it to break down. It went on under special difficulties in Birmingham. They had to pay 5s. per week per room rent. The Bill proposed no such rent to be paid by the denomination. It came to an end because the present Bishop of Manchester, then the leader of the Church in Birmingham, preferred that there should be in all the council schools in Birmingham religious education given under the Cowper-Temple clause by the stipendiary teachers of the school, and that had gone on with the greatest satisfaction for several years now. It might be that all over the country the clergy and their lay helpers would show the same energy and the same continuous zeal and industry in this matter and use that right of entry to the same extent and for as many years, as was the case in Birmingham. But if they did not, it required very little power of prophecy to see what would happen. He did not know what the Socialist Labour Churches would have to say to this. They would be perfectly right in claiming the same entry, and it would be quite within the province of the law. Various churches would be able to do all sorts of indirect and improper things, and this was just the kind of provision which often made members of a church do things in their corporate capacity which they would not think of doing in private life. Under this Bill dishonourable incentives would be held out to teachers. At the present moment there were many assistant teachers and a few head teachers unemployed. There was a glut of teachers, and there were over 1,000 more certificated teachers more than work could be found for in the schools. That state of things would be probably worse next year and the year after, so wise had been the policy of the Board of Education. Just when this glut of teachers was at its worst the Government proposed to allow assistant teachers to give sectarian teaching. There would be many schools managed by a nominated committee upon which there was a majority of persons belonging to one particular church, and in all those schools the assistant teachers would by this Bill be placed under an indirect compulsion to volunteer to give the sectarian teaching which the majority of the committee would like to see taught. He agreed with those hon. Members who said it was cowardly to cast upon the Organisation of the teachers the responsibility of protecting the teachers. They were imposing this task upon persons who were in all respects public servants, almost on the same footing as those in the Civil Service. They were placing upon the teachers the onus of refusing these invitations to give sectarian teaching, coupled with the danger of offending the committee. As a teacher for many years his objection to this Bill was very great, and from the administrative point of view his objections were tremendous. They were greater still from the point of view of a Liberal and a Nonconformist. Those three points of view taken together made him feel so strongly against this Bill that he could hardly find words forcible enough to express his feeling on this question. It was difficult to realise that such a measure could come from a Liberal Government. The noble Lord opposite appeared to be exceedingly doubtful whether this Bill was a good bargain from his point of view, and he gathered from hon. Members opposite that they thought they were giving a great deal away. He wished to assure them that they were not. Let them take, for example, a village school managed by six persons, four appointed as foundation managers by the trust upon which the school was held, one by the parish council, and another by the local education authority. Under this Bill the vicar and his churchwarden, and some good laywoman, would probably be managers of the school, and there might be two or three persons of another complexion and another school of religious thought. They would not appoint the teacher or dismiss the head teacher, but with that exception they would have under this Bill as much power as they had at present. Under the present law in that school, upon four days out of five religious instruction of the Cowper-Temple order was taught, and on not more than one morning per week was Church of England instruction given as a rule. Now it was proposed to allow two mornings per week expressly for that purpose, and on three mornings of the week only would the children receive Cowper-Temple instruction from the paid teachers. The proposal under this Bill was that if the parents wished it on two mornings in the week their children could have religious instruction from those other teachers in those very forms which had hitherto been tolerated only on one day per week. He could assure the noble Lord opposite that he was losing so little that he ought to close with this bargain while he might. Another characteristic of this Bill was that it included the odious name of "contracting-out." The whole of the secular instruction was directly under the control of the local education authority, and very little real power rested in the hands of the voluntary schools committee. Every month the education committees were absorbing into their hands more power, and every month more voluntary schools were being closed. Nearly 1,000 Church of England schools had been closed or transferred since 1902. In the last year reported upon Church of England schools were being closed at the rate of three per week and the rate would soon be four per week. That process would go on in an increasing ratio if this Bill did not interfere with the process. This was inevitable because the managers could not find the money to keep up the fabric and the repairs of the schools for which the managers were responsible. In this Bill they said to managers of those schools: "You need not do that; you can contract-out and come out of the control of the local education authority and then you need not rebuild your school or go to the expense of getting better lighting, ventilation, or warming." Under those circumstances, having contracted-out, the local authority could not make them put their schools in a proper condition, and of course they would contract out. As a matter of fact, they were getting a bribe to induce them to take that course by the higher grant which would be given them. From every point of view, whether Liberal, Nonconformist, or educational, this was a bad Bill. It was a Bill that would damage principles which on the Ministerial side of the House they held very dear. It was a Bill which would damage what every hon. Member of this House ought to protect, namely, educational efficiency. It was a Bill to divide, not to unite; to bring a sword, not an olive-branch. Any Liberal Member who supported this Bill would regret it in days to come.

*MR. MASSIE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said the primary attitude which he, for one, adopted towards this Bill was not one of the negative criticism of which they had heard so much that night, and which, when combined with dismal prophecy and an entire absence of constructiveness, was so remarkably easy to give utterance to, but an earnest desire to see whether the Bill could not be made to do. He thought that was a reasonable attitude. He certainly did not accept at all the view that the educational system of this country was a matter to be decided between Nonconformists and Churchmen or any other religious bodies. But it seemed that nothing practical could just now be achieved without such a conference as that which had taken place. Now they had an honest Minister mediating between two mutually suspicious, yet equally honest parties, and like an honest broker, as he had described himself, he was endeavouring to help two delicately situated clients to drive a bargain. There were things, he assumed, in the Bill which were not fundamentally connected with the compromise, and he therefore assumed that in Committee criticisms and suggestions would be welcomed by the Minister for Education, provided they did not fundamentally subvert the agreement which had been arrived at. If they could not turn a blind eye to the defects of the Bill, they could, and he thought they ought to, turn a favourable eye towards those elements in it which were open to favourable construction. Their aim was peace, if not entirely with honour, with as much honour as the circumstances permitted. They were not to be drawn aside in order to balance too finely the two sides of the treaty, the give and take. When they were offered an extension of public control and public appointment of teachers they were not disposed to carp at it because it was not more complete. Nor did they feel inclined to refuse abolition of direct tests because some intriguers here and there might scheme to get behind the protecting statute and induce the assistant teacher to promise, before his appointment, to give denominational instruction. It had been suggested by the National Union of Teachers that those assistant teachers who so volunteered would afterwards be picked out for promotion, and that others who did not volunteer would proportionately suffer; but it occurred to him that it was not likely that the Church party would take away from his post an assistant teacher who was there serving them well in order to promote him to a head teachership where he could not serve them at all in the same capacity. Further, when they got rid of public payment for denominational teaching they were not going to treat it as a fatal flaw because the occasional use of class rooms might be permitted which were kept in order, with the rest of the school house, from public money. So much for what they received, and they did not wish to exaggerate its importance. Now as to what they gave. He would say that it was more substantial than some of its recipients acknowledged it to be. The right of entry stuck in the throat not only of Nonconformists but of a vast number who stood aloof from churches and clergy of all kinds, and who had always been satisfied and proud, like the railway men of Swindon, because of the harmonious working of their schools, which they had attributed, perhaps disproportionately, to their freedom from the clerical presence. To them the right of entry—even if it was not the right of the parson to put his thumb on the latch and walk in at pleasure and count his flock and summon them to follow him, but only access under strict regulations to a class room for the teaching of the children whom the parents expressly and individually consigned to him—nevertheless this right of entry would be a bitter pill. Would the clergy just consider, if the patients were reversed, if they had to swallow it themselves, what gall and wormwood it would be! But he drew comfort for himself from two reflections: first, that it was in a sense just; for if the contentious subject of religion was taught in the schools at all, then, besides the religion, broadly speaking, common to all, it was just to give facilities to special consciences when they were in evidence, so long as the unity and discipline of the school and administrative practicabilities admitted it. This was the plan in some parts of Australia, and it worked well, but he must remember that in Australia there was no Established Church. If this plan did not work, then the only alternative for the State was to confine itself to the provision of secular education. He himself held the opinion that the secular function was the only function of a secular State. If he disbelieved in the State establishment of religion in the country he could not believe at the same time in the State establishment of religion in the schools. Such an arrangement, therefore, would be contrary to his own strong conviction; but he hoped he was not only a man of conviction, but a man of practicability, and he felt assured that England was not yet ripe for the secular solution, though he could not help thinking that, owing partly to the bitterness of recent religious or anti-religious discussion, England was ripening fast for it. If England was still far off from it, she was nearer than once she was to a general acknowledgment of the truth of Guizot's saying, that the State had no function either to teach religion or to have religion taught in its name. He admitted that, especially to the adherents of a State secular system, right of entry was a step backwards, but that step backward must not lead them to overlook the step forward. There were those whose dislike would be palliated if option were left to the local authorities. He could not, however, exalt into a principle the difference between a statute of a representative Parliament and a statute of the representative local authority, provided the local authority was left free to consider local possibilities. It was mainly a question of expediency, and many local authorities for reasons of expediency preferred the statute by the State. He knew that these facilities, however carefully regulated, would be—or were at present—obnoxious to the teachers themselves. He had shown they were not alone, and they had, like others, good reasons on their side. They, and others with them, found the plan of contracting-out obnoxious too. But schools demanding a peculiar atmosphere from the first moment to the last, from the opening of the door to the closing of it, and limited by tests in the choice of teachers, while one of the fundamental tenets there taught was that their Church was right and all other Churches wrong, could not be national schools and could not be part of a national system. That did seem to him a question of principle, and it was not sacrificed in the Bill. Expediencies, as in the Bill, could be sacrificed on the shrine of an expediency which was greater. But, in that case, every one must give something. Even religion could not have all it wanted, neither could administration, nor teachership, nor even education. All things, even good things, must contribute their item to the sacrifice; only by that means, it appeared, could what was on the whole a great step forward be taken and a long postponed boon to the country be at last attained.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester): The hon. Member opposite very good-naturedly rather chaffed me for being responsible for breaking down the Bill of the present Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1906. Well, Sir, if I could take credit for the loss of that I should be extremely proud, but I do not regret it in the least. I think that the hon Member's affection, at the present time, at any rate, for the Chief Secretary rather leads him to forget what the final outcome of that Bill was as regards the Catholics. He had in his mind what was known as Clause 4, but that proposal in its latest form, so far as the Catholics are concerned, was liable to break down distinctly, from either of two causes. First, there were conditions of getting four-fifths or three-quarters—I forget which—but at any rate of getting that proportion of all the parents whether voting or not, and, secondly, there was the fact that the whole scheme would collapse if an infinitesimal number of children who could not be turned out of the school demanded Cowper-Temple teaching, and alternative accommodation could not be found for them. That, from the Catholic point of view, as we were advised by our experts, rendered it absolutely unsafe for us to accept the Bill. But in addition to that the whole thing might have been set aside by a recalcitrant local authority who could have compelled the schools to have recourse to an even worse form of contracting-out than that proposed in the present Bill. If the Bill had become law that would have been the Catholic situation, and we should have been deprived of some of our schools. I have no hesitation in repeating that I, for one, am truly thankful that that Bill never became law. Now, as regards the present Bill, like the hon. Member for the Scotland division of Liverpool, I venture to say in the name of the Catholics, it is quite impossible for us to accept this Bill. From start to finish of the measure there is only one point which to my mind is in any degree acceptable. I allude to Clause 3, which lays down the condition regarding new schools. I quite admit that that admission of new schools—of future voluntary schools—is an enormous surrender by the party opposite. My special gratitude, however, speaking as a Catholic, is to the Archbishop of Canterbury for having insisted that that clause should be put in this Bill. It is clear from the correspondence that not only is the insertion of this clause in the Bill entirely due to him, and although of course I am sure it will be taken full advantage of by the Church of England, none the less I recognise gratefully and as publicly as I can, that the Archbishop in asking for that clause knew that it would be of special advantage to my co-religionists. At the same time I do not think it would be fair of me if I did not also thank the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill for having persuaded the Nonconformists to accept this condition. I appreciate the fact that it lays down as a principle of the Bill which the right hon. Gentleman hopes is going to become an Act that definite denominational schools will be able to be established in the future in this country where they do not now exist. However impossible it may be to maintain these schools when we get them, still I admit and repeat that that is an enormous surrender on the part of the Government on this particular point. I regret that that is the only point in the whole Bill which, speaking as a Catholic, I can possibly find for which to say a good word. As regards the right of entry, I can quite understand the views of the Church of England. I recognise that they feel that there are in the council schools a large number of children belonging to their faith. They want to get into these schools and to teach these children the religion of the Church of England, but I do not see that in this Bill what they ask for is obtained. As the conditions appeal to me, the right of entry seems to be purely illusory. That may be a strong thing to say, but I believe it. I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon, I quite recognise that he does not mean that they should be illusory. I did see, however, a report of a speech of a colleague of his, the Financial Secretary to the War Office, and I certainly took it for granted that that hon. Gentleman was speaking the views of the Government. I distinctly understood his speech to mean that, whatever sacrifice the Nonconformists were making in theory by giving way to this right of entry, in practice it would prove quite nugatory and that they need not trouble about it. If I have misinterpreted the hon. Gentleman's remarks, of course I will at once recall what I have stated, but that is my recollection of how I read his speech, and I have no doubt that there are other hon. Members who have seen it and may have a copy of it. Though I am a Catholic, and in the division which I have the honour to represent in this House there are only six Catholic schools, still, there are an enormous number of Church of England schools, and if the Church of England will allow me to speak for these schools, I would say that I think this Bill, as far as they are concerned, well, is not dishonest, but is absolutely illusory for the purposes of a definite right of entry. As far as we Catholics are concerned it practically amounts to this: we are told that if we have a conscience we have got to suffer for it; we have got to pay our rates for other schools to which we cannot send our children. You give us grants for our own schools which you know places us outside the national system of education and will compel us to underpay our teachers. It will place us absolutely at the mercy of the local authority for all extras, scholarships, etc. That is as I understand; and all the time the Board of Education will insist on our keeping up the same measure of efficiency as the other schools in the country. They will be the judges of whether we do so or not, and when they consider that we are not doing so—and it will be impossible for us to do so—then they will come down upon us and deprive us of the grant given under this Bill and gradually attempt to crush us out of existence. That is the treatment we get from the great Liberal party; the party of freedom, of equality, and of toleration! And to whom do you give this freedom? To that one community, that one religious body in this country, which admittedly has the largest percentage of the very poor. Now what are these grants? The late Bill of the Government gave us 47s. I understand that an Answer was given at Question time to-day to the effect that the new arrangement of the grants as calculated by the Board of Education would give to the Catholics an average of 48s. 9d. Well, it is quite impossible in the time that the Government have allowed us in their hurry to press on with this Bill to obtain and work out our own figures with any sufficient accuracy. But I will tell the right hon. Gentleman that we give them credit for having given us 1s. more, and I am quite willing to think that that 1s. is coming, because we have always been told that the 47s. would become 50s. I am afraid that will not by any means meet the situation. We worked out this Bill, not at 48s. 9d., but 49s. 9d., let us call it 50s. I have got here a return of a Catholic school in Clerkenwell. The average attendance last year was 787; the present salaries of the teachers amount to £2,407 and the present cost of maintenance to £495, making a total of £2,902. Assuming that this school got its allowance under the schedule of this Bill it would receive £1,869, which would leave a balance to be found annually of £1,033 for this one school. A school in a poor part of London—and all our schools are in poor parts of London—one school alone will have from voluntary sources to obtain over a thousand pounds to keep it up to its present state of efficiency. That is not all. The right hon. Gentleman this afternoon in his speech said that he had specially adopted this scheme in the Schedule raising the proportion, in order to meet the Catholic case.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No. I did not say that. I did not do it specially to meet the Catholic case, but what I did say was that at that scale and upwards there would be more money for the smaller schools, because it was anticipated that in many cases, many non-Catholic children would come out of the schools and make the cost correspondingly higher.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT: That is my point. I should like to say about the school I was mentioning just now that in that school there were five non-Catholic children. The right hon. Gentleman admits that this 55s. is specially put in the Bill for the benefit of the Catholics.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No, I do not admit that. It is for the benefit of others.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT: Well, it will be an advantage to us, but will the House believe that the number of schools we have got in this country which will draw the 55s. is only sixty-four, and that the number of Catholic children that will be entitled to earn that higher grant is only about 3,000? The right hon. Gentleman comes down here and advocates his putting in this 55s. because it is going to benefit the Catholics. I am not suggesting for a moment that he was aware of the conditions of the figures I have quoted, but if my figures are right I think the Catholics of this country are entitled to an apology from the right hon. Gentleman for that part of his speech. The right hon. Gentleman said with reference to our figure of £35,000 being required in London alone under this Bill, that our figures were wrong and that we did not know how many non-Catholic children may go out of our schools. Well, the right hon. Gentleman does not know either, and if he disputes our figures I will undertake to get our financial experts from Liverpool and London and let them meet him and his round a table and see who has got them right. Under this Bill, we maintain that in London we shall have to find £35,000 a year. I cannot speak with any definite accuracy as to the amount we shall have to find in the country, but taking the country as a whole, I understand that the Catholic body will have to find no less than about £214,500. Let me tell the House that in London alone since the 1902 Act, in order to comply with its demands—its legitimate demands—that our schools should be brought up to date and put into a proper state of efficiency, we, the Catholics in London, have spent no less than £200,000, and now we are to be further fined by an annual sum of about £35,000. Of course, it is absolutely impossible for the Catholics to accept this Bill. I think the right hon. Gentleman suggested that the pooling system would be of benefit to us, but I must remind the House that whereas pooling may very likely be advantageous to the Church of England, it is of no use to us. Our schools are practically all on the same level of poverty, and it is quite useless to think that pooling will be any advantage whatever to the Catholic schools of this country. When I came down here this afternoon I received a copy of a statement drawn up by the Roman Catholic bishops of this country, which will be published in the newspapers to-morrow, and the unanimous opinion of the Catholic bishops of England and Wales absolutely condemns this Bill. We have heard also to-day that this Bill has been unanimously condemned by the Education Committee of the London County Council, and I can well imagine that other county councils will also condemn it. We know it is condemned by all the associations of teachers throughout the country. It can be no settlement. From the Catholic point of view the Government ought to remember this. What our bishops have said to-day every Catholic man and woman in the country will say to-morrow, every Catholic father and every Catholic mother. They will not accept this Bill. It not only will be no settlement, but what is far more serious, it certainly will not bring peace.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that in considering this question of education, which was of such intense interest to the country, he asked the House to look at the situation as it had developed in the past since 1870, when for the first time a national system under which the children were compulsorily trained was instituted. They had had the advantage of something like forty years experience, and during that time the nation had risen to an appreciation of the advantages and the absolute necessity of developing that system throughout the country. In order to make the system more complete it was felt that public funds must be available for higher education, and so technical instruction had been recognised as an important element, on the extension of which the commercial interests of the country depended. In 1902 the late Government brought in a Bill to make further financial provision for elementary schools, and also to co-ordinate the higher branches of education. At that time it was found that the civic idea under which the board schools were being developed was challenged by the denominational interest that had been included in the national settlement of 1870, upon terms that were well understood and at the time accepted. If he mistook not, by the arrangements that were then made, it was agreed that in return for the privilege of teaching the denominational catechisms and special aspects of religious truth in the interest of the various churches, they, enjoying these privileges, were willing to subscribe a certain amount of money over and above the ordinary Parliamentary grants, and thus with the help of the pence of the school children the cost of the maintenance of denominational schools was met by them, whilst the Government and Parliament at that time in developing the school board system recognised that as municipal institutions having the Parliamentary grants and also the rates, they must of necessity be kept apart from the conflicting interests into which they as individuals divided themselves in regard to religious matters. So the dual system was continued, but at that time, although they were then sitting on the other side of the House, they endeavoured as far as it was possible with their limited opportunities to influence the Government, although they failed, to insist that where public money was paid public control must follow. At that time he remembered well that a very large number of Unionist Members, recognising the danger to which the policy of the Government would lead, endeavoured to induce the Prime Minister, now the Leader of the Opposition, to alter the basis upon which the management in future would be conducted in the voluntary schools, which then carried with it the selection of the head teacher by the vote of a committee the majority of which was appointed by the vicar, in the interest of the church. The result of this had been that the nation had divided itself into two hostile camps, and they found themselves to-day in an unfortunate position which he would not dwell upon. In the interest of education they were all agreed that an end should be put to this strife. How could it be done? It had been urged that in a secular system there was the easiest and most logical method. To many of them such a proposal was highly dangerous and unsatisfactory. At the present moment many of them believed that it was far better to meet those from whom they differed in religious matters in order that they might secure a continuance of the Bible as the basis of religious instruction in the schools, and so they were striving to arrive at a settlement by consent. Material interests were important, but in the large mass of the people of this country there was a deep conviction that the highest welfare of the State could only be secured by an educated race of citizens who recognised the claims of religion and high character. In looking at this question they were face to face with the fact that there were vested interests. Prior to 1870 the Church of England backed by the resources entrusted to it as the established church of the nation by Parliament did its best to fulfil its duties in regard to the education of the young, and, therefore, it was right that the interests of its schools should be carefully considered. In the measure now before the House a continuance of Parliamentary grants at least equal to, and he would venture to say far beyond, the figures on which these schools were originally established, was now offered to them by the Government. A scheme of contracting out was proposed, and, notwithstanding the objections which could easily be urged against it, it was a scheme which ought to meet the views of those earnest religionists who, for the sake of conscience, could not accept the control of the State. Under these circumstances the scheme was worthy of the careful consideration of everyone affected. The teachers strongly objected to the contracting out clause; they did not like serving under clerical influences, and they feared that these would be promoted in contracted-out schools. At the present time these must be recognised and fairly dealt with. The right of entry given by the Bill was a concession to the religious feelings of those whose case the Government were anxious to meet, while endeavouring to secure a national system which should be open to as little criticism as possible. The Minister for Education had admitted that this was in no sense an ideal system, but at the same time he was bringing it forward in the interest of peace. Members for the House were there to deal with public questions in the public interest, and not to bring about the immediate gain of the Churches with which they might be connected. At the same time there were matters in which interests were so conflicting that it was desirable to move by way of compromise. That was the only plan which would prevent a continuance of the fighting between the voluntary system and what was known as the board school or public school system. In the interest of religious peace and educational efficiency the sooner they got rid of the present difficulty the better. Under this scheme Churchmen on the one hand, and Nonconformists on the other, might feel that, without sacrifice of principle, a *via media* had been found. The right of entry was seriously objected to by many, and on the other hand it was urged that it would not be largely used. Experience alone would show which was right, both sides might however be content in not legislating in advance of public opinion. If both would give up some of the things they had been contending for, surely there might be evolved a scheme which would settle the question for many years to come. If it was not a permanent settlement, it would be because the nation did not support it, and those who came after the present representatives would have to deal with fresh legislative proposals to meet the feelings of the day. The Minister for Education and the Prime Minister, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury, had striven to secure a compromise in the interest of peace and educational progress, and the House might congratulate them on the spirit in which they had conducted the negotiations. When the question appeared to be nearing a settlement, it was deemed necessary that the various sections of Nonconformists should meet and consider what course should be pursued with reference to the action of the Government in the matter. A meeting was held upstairs at which he moved a Resolution which assured the Government of their support, and that Resolution was carried by an overwhelming majority. It was premature yet to speak in regard to the volume of opinion in the country in favour of this measure, but there was evidence which was accumulating day by day that the great bulk of the people of England were anxious to have the difficulty settled in a fair and reasonable spirit. As to the Wesleyan Methodist Church, with which he was connected, he had to say that a large and important committee called from all parts of the country would meet on Friday to consider the question. In the meantime the President of the Wesleyan Conference had in the Press expressed a personal opinion which led them to recognise that his great influence would be decidedly on the side of those who were endeavouring to settle this question. He believed that his own church and the great mass of moderate opinion throughout the country was on the side of those who desired, if possible, to bring to an end the disastrous conflicts of the past. He heartily supported the scheme now put before the House by the Government, believing that in doing so he was serving the best interests of the children and of education.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS (Manchester, N.W.) said he did not think he had ever addressed a meeting with a greater sense of responsibility than he felt in addressing the House on the question of this Bill. During the last few days he had received many communications from the county of Lancashire asking him to express, and express strongly, the voice and feeling of the people of Lancashire on the Bill, and their entire disapproval of the compromise embodied in it. He was glad the Minister for Education gave those who were opposed to the Bill credit for conscientious motives. He could not help feeling that the extremists on both sides —those who like the hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill were extreme Nonconformists and those who opposed the Bill and were of the Church of England or the Church of Rome—might really be considered most conscientious in the matter; and that if the Bill was to be carried at all it would be carried through by pressure of a large mass of public opinion which was tired of the question and wanted to get it out of the way. A very large number of people went about and said they did not care a button about the question if they could only get it out of the way. He was not troubled by any of those conscientious scruples which some of the supporters of the Government seemed to have. There never was a better example of a good man struggling with adversity than the hon. Member for Norfolk. He did his very utmost to square his conscience with his previous speeches, and with the compromise embodied in the Bill. Whilst he endeavoured to persuade the House that the Bill was one which Nonconformists of his type could conscientiously recommend and support, he gave them a warning—a warning which he thought those bishops and others who were supporting the compromise might well take to heart—that this by no means ensured finality. He described them as emergency proposals, as the immediate demands of Nonconformists, and as instalments. He wanted to know when the other instalments were going to be asked for. How long was this educational truce going to last? When was the hon. Member's conscience going to get the better of his compromising spirit, and when was he going to come down to the House and ask for further instalments, and to have the Church and denominational schools handed over entirely to the Cowper-Temple system? The hon. Member was good enough to tell them that he could not get the legislation he wanted. He agreed. The Government had brought in three Bills all more or less pleasing to the hon. Member opposite, and they had been unable to carry any of them, because they knew the feeling of the country was diametrically opposed to them. They had, therefore, been bound to bring in some Bill which they thought might effect a compromise. He was wondering when the argument of the mandate was going to be trotted out. The last speaker referred to it. He was going to ask whether this Bill represented the mandate and whether indeed that mandate was really in existence to-day. He denied that the 1906 election gave any mandate for the suppresson of the Church of England, Roman Catholic, or other denominational schools. He was prepared to admit there was a mandate, considerably overlaid by Chinese labour and other subjects, to remove the legitimate grievances of Nonconformists in single school areas, and they would be perfectly prepared, as he had said on many platforms in Lancashire, to support a compromise which would remove those grievances without imposing tenfold grievances in the Church of England, Roman Catholics, and Jews in the multiple school areas. This Bill, while removing the Nonconformist grievances in single school areas, did impose tenfold grievances on Churchmen in multiple school areas. It was on behalf of the great county of Lancashire that he desired to put some views before the House with regard to the multiple school areas. They had perhaps in Lancashire more than in other parts of the country adhered to their Church schools. They had heard of the devotion of the Roman Catholics to their schools, but the Church—he did not mean the clergy, but the people like the working men of the great towns of Lancashire—were just as devoted to their Church schools, and just as determined to secure their continuance as their Roman Catholic friends on the other side of St. George's Channel were determined to secure the continuance of their schools. They made sacrifices prior and subsequent to the Act of 1870, and even after the Act of 1902, to keep their schools going, and he wanted the House to realise that a large number of children were still being educated in their schools. Roughly speaking, there were 2,500,000 children being educated to-day in the voluntary schools, despite the efforts to hinder their continuance and the difficulties they had in keeping their funds going. There were nearly as many children being educated in voluntary as in provided schools. They asked for no privileges, and they had had no privileges. The Nonconformists could have built schools. He saw opposite one of the most prominent members of the Wesleyan community. They had built schools. There was a considerable number of Wesleyan schools in existence, and they had exactly the same share under the Act of 1902 in the rates, which were provided not merely by Wesleyans, but also by Churchmen and Roman Catholics. He had been wondering how the hon. Baronet the Member for Louth felt with regard to the provisions of the Bill. He remembered that on the Second Reading of the Bill of the present First Lord of the Admiralty the hon. Member made an eloquent speech in which he said that the Nonconformist party felt that they had been sold. If that was so with regard to that Bill, he must feel to-day that he had not been sold, but given away. That was the feeling of a vast body of Church people, not merely in the country districts, where their schools were to be swept away, but in the large towns of Lancashire. In Lancashire they had a very large majority of voluntary schools. There were eight large boroughs with no provided schools at all, the whole of the schools were denominational. The people of Lancashire desired a system of concurrent endowments which would be perfectly fair and which could be perfectly easily granted. The Minister for Education had referred to the system of education in Germany. They would like that system. They had there a system of concurrently endowed Roman and Lutheran and other forms of Protestant schools. Let them have the same in this country—Roman, Jewish, Church, and Nonconformist schools. He did not believe there was so much difference amongst Nonconformists as to make it a real necessity——

MR. RUNCIMAN: If the hon. Member says there is no difference between the different Nonconformist bodies, he certainly does not know much about them.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS said he thought there was not so much difference in the doctrines of the various Nonconformist bodies as would make it difficult for them to unite in a school on Cowper-Temple teaching. They were apparently all satisfied to-day with Cowper-Temple teaching.

MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon): That is not Nonconformist teaching.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS: They are satisfied with Cowper-Temple teaching.

MR. WILLIAM JONES: Not because it is Nonconformist teaching.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS said he had sufficient faith in the honesty and conscientious motive of the great Nonconformist bodies to assume that if they were not satisfied with Cowper-Temple teaching they would make the same disturbance they did when they were not satisfied. In 1870 there were two or three courses open to the Government. He could hardly venture to imagine what the view of Mr. Gladstone would have been if anyone had proposed the secular solution. They could have abolished the denominational school and have given Cowper-Temple religion. That was not the policy of the Liberal Party, or of Mr. Gladstone, or of Mr. Forster. Their policy was to allow two systems of schools to run side by side with equal contributions from the State, and it was only because of the extreme pressure of denominational needs in the latter years of the last century that denominationalists were compelled to come to Parliament in 1902 and ask, not for any favour or privilege, but merely for a share of those rates they themselves paid in order that their schools could be kept up and have a chance of coming up to the standard of efficiency of the schools in which Cowper-Temple religion was taught. To-day, after all their sacrifices, they were to be asked by the Government—and he said very bitterly by their Archbishop—to surrender. The Licensing Bill and this Bill afforded the only instances of modern times of the Liberal Party being supported by the bishops, and of the Liberal Party supporting the bishops in the way they were doing to-day. They did not intend to be ridden down even by the opinion of so eminent a man as the Archbishop. This was a layman's question. When the right hon. Gentleman wanted the opinion of the Nonconformists he did not go to Dr. Clifford.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Oh, yes; Dr. Clifford is supporting the Bill.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS did not understand that the right hon. Gentleman went exclusively to Dr. Clifford or the Nonconformist divines. He took a hundred representatives of Nonconformist lay opinion into his confidence and asked them their opinion; but when he wanted to know the opinion and the needs of the Church of England so far as he could see he went to the Archbishop and did not consult a single Member in the House, or one single representative of the parents in that body. They were being asked to surrender their schools which they had kept up for so many years past at great personal sacrifice. Those who knew anything of Lancashire knew what sacrifices the working-men had made to keep their schools, their bazaars, their sales, their collections, and their individual contributions. It was those men, and not the Bishops, for whom he was pleading. They were asked to surrender the right of appointing their teachers, to surrender what they considered their right to an equal share in the rates which they themselves paid. They were asked to tear up the trust-deeds of those who gave money or land for the building of schools in bygone years, and to hand the whole of their buildings, with a very inadequate recompense, over to the public authority. Someone had suggested that if he had to choose between hanging and drowning he did not very much mind which it was. The choice here lay between joining in the scheme of education and handing their schools over to the public authority, and contracting-out. The choice was between sudden death and death by slow process of starvation. It was perfectly clear that if they contracted-out it could only result in slow process of starvation. What did they receive for all those surrenders which they were asked by the Government and by their own Archbishop to make? They received the right of entry into the council schools. Some of them thought that the right of entry belonged to them to-day, and that they had been kept out of it by the action of the opposite party. Some of them believed that the council schools belonged to them as much as to others, because they paid rates for their maintenance just as much as the Nonconformists did. But he went farther. The right of entry he believed to be entirely insufficient. They wanted more than the right of entry. They wanted schools of their own. That was the demand of Lancashire. They wanted religious education to be given to their children because they felt that religion was a necessary part of education. Education was made compulsory and free, and they had no right to compel them to send their children to a school where the fundamental teaching—that of religion—was not that which they approved. That, he understood from the Member for North-West Norfolk, was the old Nonconformist position. "You may not take my child under the provision of compulsory education and bring him up as an atheist. That is diametrically opposed to the inherent rights of manhood and of parenthood. You may not take a Nonconformist child and bring him up as a Churchman or a Roman Catholic, and you have no right to take the child of a Churchman and bring him up as a Cowper-Templer." That was the view which had been sanctioned at bye-election after bye-election during the past few months, and that was the view which was sanctioned all over Lancashire last month in the unprecedented number of gains at the municipal elections. Throughout the whole of the large towns of Lancashire where denominational schools predominated there was an overwhelming majority in favour of the maintenance of denominational schools. They were asked to accept the right of entry for two days a week, and on the other days they were to have Cowper-Temple teaching. One of the great reasons why they had been asked to support this Bill was that it ensured throughout the land simple Christian teaching in every school. That, however, was not provided for under the Bill. He did not represent the extreme wing of the English Church. He happened to be a decided Low Churchman, and simple Bible teaching was absolutely sufficient for his child. But when they asked him, or any one of the parents in his constituency, why he was not satisfied with simple Bible teaching the reply was: "What right have you to discuss the question of the kind of religious education with which I am satisfied. Go and deal with your child and leave me to deal with the religious education of mine." The Bill did not provide for simple Christian teaching. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the bench of bishops had been misled on that point. What the Bill provided for was Cowper-Templeism, which was very different from simple Christian teaching. It simply meant the teaching of religion which did not touch any creeds or formularies.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): The Apostles Creed.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS asked if the Apostles Creed was a compulsory part of Cowper-Temple teaching. [Cries of "No."] That was his point, that the local education authorities throughout the country could and did give teaching under the provisions of the Cowper-Temple clause, which was, undoubtedly, not simple Bible teaching, not even Christian teaching. They gave moral teaching, and one knew there was a certain number of schools and of school boards which gave no Christian teaching at all, particularly in the Nonconformist centres of Wales. He should like an explanation how the right hon. Gentleman was going to enforce simple Bible teaching throughout the schools of the land. How was he going to deal with those school areas which did not even have a prayer or a hymn, which did not read the Bible at all, and those which read it without explanation? Were they going to mandamus half the education authorities in Wales, and some of the large borough authorities, to make them give the simple Bible teaching which the Archbishop thought he had secured by the provisions of this Bill? Even if Cowper-Temple teaching was a reality, and was going to be made a reality by the right hon. Gentleman, what were they who believed in denominational teaching to have? The right two days in the week to go into the schools, subject to the consent of the local education authority, and either by themselves, by the clergy or anybody nominated by them, or by the existing teachers, if the local education authorities permitted, to give denominational education. Existing head teachers were allowed to give it for life. Were they to speculate on the life of the headmaster? If he lived twenty years a transferred school might remain with some guarantee of denominational education. But he might die to-morrow, and then denominational teaching in that school would quickly go by the board. Though they might insure his life they could not insure his denominational teaching. A new headmaster might be brought in without any test, without any question being asked whether he believed the religious education he was prepared to give. He understood there were few teachers in the transferred schools who could be the donors of denominational teaching, because in poor districts it would be impossible to get voluntary teachers to come day by day. They could not afford it. The only available teachers would be those who might be prepared to volunteer. They were not to have the right to ask them when they were being appointed whether they believed, not merely in the denominational teaching they professed to give, but in the simple Bible teaching which they were also to give. If the local education authority did not mean to deal fairly by the Act there would be very little denominational teaching. What would be the condition in the West Riding of Yorkshire? Were the local education authorities there likely to find it scholastically convenient to set aside rooms for denominational teaching? Were they likely to find it convenient to allow the teachers to give it? If they got denominational teaching they had to pay a portion of the teachers' salaries in addition to rent. They were to pay a certain sum of money towards the cost of denominational teaching in order that Cowper-Temple teaching might be made cheaper for their Nonconformist friends. From the educational standpoint the position was absolute folly. Any parent could nominate someone to give the denominational instruction to his child, and 100 parents might send 100 different teachers. In one part of the country a plan of campaign on those lines was being drawn up by people who wished to wreck the Bill. There would be no discipline in the denominational classes, no organisation provided for them if the headmaster was against it, and there would be no compulsion to attend denominational teaching. There might be ten religions at once being taught in any school. The Secretary to the Admiralty described the right of entry two years ago as pandemonium.

Dr. MACNAMARA: No.

Mr. JOYNSON-HICKS said that it was on an Amendment moved by the hon. Member for East Marylebone that the hon. Member had said that. There was one council school in North-West Manchester where there were ten different religions represented, but there were not ten class rooms. How was right of entry going to be carried out there? The Liberal Party justified the right of entry concession by the fact that it had got something in return. He had always thought the Liberals' objection to it was a matter of conscience. If it was, it did not matter one iota what they got in return. With regard to the transfer of the schools they were being asked, in single-school areas, to transfer schools which were the property of the denomination, of the trustees and of the parents, and they were given the option in the multiple-school area of transferring them or contracting-out. There was to be no appeal to the Law Courts, for the Minister for Education did not care to face twelve men in a jury box, but preferred to be both prosecutor and Judge. If the schools of the Church had been for sale they might have been prepared to bargain, but they were not erected for the purpose of being sold, and he objected most strongly to their being taken at any price. In the case of the Swansea School £18,000 had been spent upon it, and the price they would get for that school would be £3,225. There was a case in London where £24,000 had been spent on new schools, all of which had been raised by voluntary contributions, and they would receive for that £3,942. At St. Peter's School, Walworth, £8,000 had been spent and they would get £1,350; and St. Saviour's, Southwark, had spent £13,000 on schools and they would receive £1,600. He could go through Lancashire, Surrey, and other places where all they would get would be about one-fifth of the money they had spent on them, not in bygone days, but in the last year or two. If they availed themselves of the privilege of contracting-out it meant death by starvation. From the point of view of the parents who desired to retain their schools the Bill was absolutely impossible. In his constituency there was a Jewish school of 2,000 children, which last year cost £6,122 to carry on. Under the new Bill it would get £4,650, leaving £1,742 to be found annually by the Jewish community, to say nothing of the cost of repairs and upkeep of the building. How was that money to be obtained, and, if it was obtained, was it fair that the Jewish community should, at the same time, be paying rates towards other schools? There was a Roman Catholic school in his constituency where the grants under the Bill would not cover the cost of the teachers' salaries.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: What about pooling?

Mr. JOYNSON-HICKS said pooling would be no remedy. All the small schools in Lancashire were in the single-school areas, and so far as Lancashire schools were concerned the grant under that Bill would be sixpence less per child than under the Bill of the First Lord of the Admiralty. In the big towns in Lancashire nearly all the schools had over 1,300 pupils. By this Bill a large number of small schools would be swept out of existence. In Lancashire there were 100 single-school areas and all the rest were large schools and had nearly 1,000 pupils in each of them. In the case of schools in the East End of London and in Manchester pooling would not give them the 47s. per head because they were under the limit of 1,300. Were they to go back to the bad old days prior to the year 1902? They would be bound in Lancashire to oppose this Bill. With regard to the correspondence which had been published, he could not help feeling as he read it through, that the right hon. Gentleman had got the better of the Archbishop. He did not wish to use hard words, but he certainly thought the Archbishop had been "jockeyed" over these negotiations. The Archbishop imposed the condition that the arrangement should not cause an intolerable strain upon the subscribers, but it was impossible to get more subscriptions in the large areas. Year after year they would have to provide in Lancashire, even with this pooling arrangement, 25s. per head to keep their schools efficient, although they contained over 1,000 children. That meant that £1,250 a year would have to be found in a poor parish, where there was not a single person living who was rich enough to keep a servant, in order to maintain their schools. How was it possible to get the money? There must have been a smile on the right hon. Gentleman's face when he made that bargain. That was the whole position. He agreed that contracting-out was entirely undesirable, but the terms of the compromise depended upon whether the Church schools could be successfully continued without an intolerable strain upon the subscribers. In the unfortunate parishes of Lancashire they had no subscribers. The friends of denominational schools did not rest their claim to the continuance of those schools in a state of efficiency upon subscriptions, but upon a right to share in the rates which they paid for educational purposes. Speaking on behalf of all the Conservative Party in Lancashire, he could assure the Prime Minister that there would not be peace until they secured justice and equal rights for their voluntary schools.

*DR. MACNAMARA: I hope the House will permit me to say a word or two on this very familiar, though rather threadbare, topic. I am no longer directly responsible in any way for the educational administration of the country. I am now at the Admiralty, but I may be excused if, like the sailor, I decline to be off with the old love though I am on with the new. Now, I may remind the House that this dangerous and disastrous educational civil war has raged intermittently in this country for exactly 100 years. The moment the State looked like taking up some responsibility in regard to the education of the people, or advancing on responsibility already entered into, then the common school became the cockpit of contending theologians, and so it has been, more or less, ever since. The last speech to which we have listened does not give a very happy augury for anything different in the future. Meanwhile other nations have been feverishly active sharpening their brains for the international competition in which all are plunged, and meanwhile, too, the governing forces of the civilised nations of the world are being rapidly revolutionised. No longer is the race to the swift and the battle to the strong; more and more must victory fall to the most highly equipped intellectually. The directors general of to-day's campaign are the electrician, the chemist, the inventor, and the scientist; and the school teacher is their agent in advance. While we have been squabbling all these years, a disparity, always deepening and widening, has been growing up between the education given to our children and that given by other great countries to theirs. It is no good for the British people to delude themselves with the characteristic complacent view that they have been divinely endowed with a monopoly of supremacy. They have not. It is perfectly true that we are a strong, enduring, and enterprising people, and we are above all a people with a unique genius for local self-government. Therefore, with these qualifications, if you will make our equipment as good as that of other people's, we are bound to come to the top; but if you leave joints in the educational armour, there is no power on earth, no rearrangement of your fiscal system, which can ultimately save us in the relentless campaign from becoming mere hewers of wood and drawers of water to the more highly equipped people of the world. Therefore, it is urgent and it is vital, that we should clear the way for educational progress; and certainly any man, in my opinion, who vexatiously persists in blocking the way, whether Liberal or Tory, Churchman or Chapel-goer, layman or cleric, has in the interests of national self-defence to be taken very firmly and very respectfully and put on one side. I think all parties in this House must be very glad to know that for a long time past there has been a growing spirit of accommodation in regard to this educational problem, and particularly among contending factions. That spirit of accommodation, though belated, is nevertheless welcome; I rejoice to see it, and I have done all I can in my small way to endeavour to foster it. This Bill—our fourth attempt in three years—is an endeavour to take advantage of that spirit. Under the Bill each party gives up cherished and long defended territory. The noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone told us to-day that this is very far indeed from being the denominational idea of a settlement. That is true. We have heard also very frequently during the day from this side of the House that it is very far indeed from being the Radical idea of a settlement. It contains features extremely distasteful to both. I am personally not in love with two or three of its features. Let me try if I can quite dispassionately, and I hope in a non-controversial spirit, to examine what each of the main belligerents gains. In the first place, the denominationalist gets the right to give denominational teaching twice a week in Council schools. If I have understood him arightly that alone is an enormous gain for him. Secondly, he gets the right to ask council school assistant teachers to give that denominational teaching; thirdly, in his own schools (which he now transfers to the local education authority) he gets the right to continue denominational teaching twice a week; fourthly, in these transferred schools he may ask the existing head teacher to be the denominational volunteer so long as he remains in his present post; and if that head teacher removes to another transferred school he may be invited to become the denominational volunteer any time up to five years after passing this Act; and fifthly, for all time the assistant teacher in the transferred school—as in the council school—may be invited to become the denominational volunteer. But let me add in passing about this volunteering that the teacher may refuse without prejudice; that the local education committee must give its sanction in every case, or rather show cause if it refuses; and that the denominationalist may pay the local education committee for the value of the teacher's services as a denominational volunteer; finally, the denominationalist, except in the single-school area, gets the right to take his school entirely outside the national system and carry with it, subject to inspection of the Board of Education, large and augmented sums of public money from the central Exchequer. Certainly, if I remember correctly the debates in 1906 both in the House of Commons and in another place, denominationalists themselves laid great stress upon the necessity for such a provision as this. They were prepared to accept it even at the then existing scale of grants. I do not wish to rake amongst the embers of the old controversies to which constant references have been made to-day as to the question of contracting-out, but those who complain of contracting-out must remember that that came first of all from the hon. Member for Glasgow University. He was the first person to move for a system of contracting-out. It was afterwards moved by the hon. Member for Preston, and it was finally suggested by the Archbishop of Canterbury in another place. The hon. Member for Oxford University and the hon. Member for the Scotland division were critical to-day in their comments on contracting-out. Really, I must ask them in fairness to remember that on 24th July, 1906, the hon. Member for Preston moved a contracting-out scheme which, like this scheme, was not to apply to single-school areas. It was based on the then existing grants. My hon. friend made no provision for additional grants. The Leader of the Opposition on that occasion said—

> "A peaceful settlement of the question was to be found in the direction of accepting rather than rejecting the Amendment."

He voted for it, and the whole of his party voted for it except the Member for South Birmingham. The whole of the Irish Party voted for it. The grants were then about 40s., and they are now round about 50s. I do not like contracting-out; but it is really a little hard that hon. Members should now be so severe on a 50s. scheme having voted themselves for a 40s. scheme. The hon. Member for the Denbigh Boroughs said that this Bill involved the violation of every Radical principle. Let us see. Let us see what the Radical gains. The Bill secures, first of all, the abolition of the dual system—an enormously important reform of a far-reaching character if I understand anything about the education of this country; secondly, except for contracted-out schools, the area of which I hope and believe will be strictly limited as a result of conceding the right of entry, he secures for the local education authority full control of all the schools in the country; thirdly, all the managers (not two out of six only), and all the teachers fall completely under the control and direction of the local education authority, except so far as the contracted-out schools are concerned. It would be difficult for me as a Radical to overstate the significance of this reform. Fourthly, the Radical secures that wherever denominational teaching is given, it must be paid for by the denominationalist himself, and not out of the public fund; and finally, and of enormous importance, he secures for every parent who wants it a free and undenominational school place for his child. I do not know how many times when Chairman of the School Accommodation Committee of the London School Board, I had to take part in compelling parents, who resided in areas where there was no board school to satisfy the law and send their children to Roman Catholic and Church of England schools. Such compulsion will exist no longer. So much for the gains of either side. Now, what does each party lose? First, the denominationalist gives up his schools, or if he continues to hold them he gets no rate-aid; secondly, in every case he pays for denominational teaching, and if he still continues to get rate-aid he can only get denominational teaching for only two days a week; thirdly, he is shut out, unless he be a member of the local education authority or its education committee, from any further voice in the selection, appointment, or promotion of the teacher; and finally, except in contracted-out schools, undenominational teaching becomes the recognised State provision for religious teaching. Denominational teaching becomes, throughout, what I may perhaps call an ancillary feature paid for by the denominationalists themselves. Then what does the Radical lose? First, he is asked to concede the right of entry into the council school, and that is a very considerable sacrifice. Consider the case of the village board school. For years the people could not get that school; territorial and ecclesiastical influences checked them at every stage. At last they surmounted all, and taxed themselves up to 1s., 2s., and even 2s. 6d. in the £, to get their little school. From that day, the children have met every morning in family unity, for religious worship and instruction. I have heard them praying together, singing their hymns together, and listening to Bible stories together. Now, the little family may be broken up, by right of entry. Sociologically I think it is a great pity, and I very much sympathise with the comment of my hon. friend, the Member for West Nottingham, that this is a very big sacrifice indeed. But, more than that, the Radical has, in the second place, to contemplate the prospect of council teachers giving denominational religious teaching; and in the third place he has to contemplate the prospect of a number of schools going right out from local control, and taking with them large grants of public money. That, in short, is a profit and loss account for each of the main parties to this dispute. I suggest that what each party has to ask itself is this: "Considering the vital national necessity to call a 'Truce of God' on this unhappy and dangerous feud, ought I to make the sacrifices involved, and if made, will they lead to a cessation of hostilities?" There is a further question which every friend of the continuance of religious education in any form must put to himself. And that is this: "If this fails, what is the only outstanding alternative?" How long do the friends of religious education think that the mass of the people of this country are going to tolerate this unseemly and dangerous wrangle? I come now to the case of the teachers. All will acknowledge the great power, circumspection, and intimate knowledge with which the hon. Member for West Nottingham has put that case. The teacher's criticisms are obviously sincere; they are not selfish; there was not a single word of selfishness in the speech of the hon. Member for West Nottingham. The teachers, I know, are inspired solely by a desire to promote and to secure educational progress so far as they understand it. That has always been their aim; and I am confident that every section of this House, recognising, as it must do, the enormous service rendered to the State by the teachers, will be ready to consider the practicability in the present situation of any representation made on behalf of men and women upon whom, in the main, the whole fabric of public elementary education rests. The teachers fear that if the council school teacher be allowed to volunteer you will have in effect a creed test imposed upon those who, since 1870, have been entirely immune from any question respecting their religious beliefs. That is a legitimate fear, as was so forcibly and eloquently stated by the hon. Member for West Nottingham. But I am entitled to point out to those who have that fear, as was stated by the Member for Denbigh very vigorously, that we have sought to meet it in the Bill by sharply divorcing those who will select, appoint, and promote the teacher from those who may ask him hereafter to volunteer. Besides, I am entitled to point out that, for the first time in the educational history of this country, if this Bill passes, we leave the council school teacher free to refuse to give even Cowper-Temple teaching. Again, teachers strongly dislike contracting-out; so do I, and so does the President of the Board of Education who told the House to-night that it was educationally objectionable, but it seems inevitable to this compromise, and as my right hon. friend said, the right of entry ought to reduce its proportions. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition voted for it, and the hon. Member for Preston in the interests of peace in 1906.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): There was then something better than the Bill now before us.

*DR. MACNAMARA: At any rate, it was not better financially than this Bill, because the grant in 1906 was round about 40s.; and under this Bill it is round about 50s.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): The grants were not fixed by the Bill of 1906. You fix them here.

*DR. MACNAMARA: All I can say is that if the Bill of 1906 had passed you would have left the grant round about 40s., whereas now by this scheme of compromise you will get roughly 10s. per child more than under the scheme of 1906. As I have already said, the right of entry which is conceded ought substantially, in my opinion, if it is of any value at all, to reduce and restrict the area of contracted-out schools. We have hedged contracting-out with all sort of precautions, and all sorts of assurances for continued educational efficiency, and I hope that I shall have the support of the right hon. Gentleman opposite when we do that. Further, we have augmented the grants to contracted-out schools; we have specially designed a scheme of pooling grants which will, I hope, enable the richer districts to help the poorer, and thus to mitigate the loss which will inevitably be sustained by their coming off the rates. There remains an entirely negligible factor so far as most of our past educational debates, as I remember them, are concerned; and that is, the parent of the child who uses the school. The hon. Member for North-West Manchester says that this is a parent's question. So it is. What does this Bill do for the parent? The hon. Member for North-West Manchester says: "Nothing." Well, in the first place, this Bill retains all the old protection of a conscience clause, except, of course, in the contracted-out schools; but the parent cannot be compelled to send his child to a contracted-out school. In the second place, everywhere the parent may now claim a free unsectarian school place for his child, if he does not believe in the denominational system taught in the contracted-out schools. That is a general right for the first time conceded. Thirdly, if a child attends a council school, and Bible-teaching is not enough, he may have something more on two days a week. Fourthly, on the other hand, you can no longer compel him to send his child to a denominational school. Fifthly, you set aside more money for education; and finally, you set free the Board of Education, with all its garnered experience, and high technical knowledge, to devote itself much more uninterruptedly than hitherto to the development of educational progress. Thus, you open the way to a due consideration of the real educational problems of the moment. I would go almost any distance in the direction of securing that. We must have the way open to the adequate treatment of real educational problems. And what are they? The health of the children; the warming, lighting, and ventilating of schools; the size of the classes; the qualifications of the teachers; the length of school life; the half-time system; the range and suitability of the curriculum—a matter of urgent importance—and the endeavour to arrive at a scientific discrimination between children who are fitted by capacity to profit by scholarships, and those who are not, a matter of even more urgent importance. Finally, the endeavour to secure the scientific treatment of the relationship which should subsist between the amount to be charged against the State for education, and the amount to be charged against the locality—also a matter of great and urgent importance, and one which, if left untreated, will lead to educational re-action, and heavily rated areas. These are the real problems, as I see them, and while the theologian blocks the way you cannot effectively get at them. But we cannot let the matter rest where it is. This Bill is an attempt to find a *modus vivendi*, and it does not please either party who have an ideal settlement in their pockets. I believe it to be an honest and sincere attempt to set our hands free, and I do appeal to the men of all parties for nothing more than this, that they should bring to the discussion of this measure the spirit in which it is conceived. Then, perchance, we may get on quietly with the educational problem and with the task of so equipping our children that they may adequately steward the great heritage which, in due course, will fall into their safe keeping.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he voted for the Second Reading of the Education Bills which the Government previously introduced into this House, and he desired to explain why he should certainly not vote for the Second Reading of this particular measure. He felt perfectly certain that if hon. Members opposite on the Ministerial benches had been asked by a Government composed of a majority of hon. Members above the gangway on the Opposition side of the House, to accept a measure containing the provisions of this Bill, they would have received it by a most militant challenge. The Liberal majority of the House approaching this Bill produced by a Conservative Government would have declared that it was obnoxious to their consciences and that it was a bad educational proposal. It was all very well for hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite to say that those who criticised this Bill were rejecting peace. He was bound to confess that if they could only convince him on that point he would go into the lobby against the Second Reading of this Bill with a great deal more reluctance than he was going to feel on that occasion. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had told them that certain extremists must be firmly and boldly set aside. He quite agreed that was a very good course to take with extremists, but as a moderate middle course sort of man, he would also remind the hon. Gentleman that those who cried "Peace, peace" when there was no peace ought also quietly and firmly to be set aside. Did any hon. Member who listened to the two speeches before the dinner-hour, one by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University, and the other by the hon. Member for the Scotland division—one representing the Conservative and Church of England policy, in so far as it had been expressed from the front Opposition bench and the other representing the Catholic sentiment and the Catholic spirit of education—did any hon. Member really mean to say, after those two speeches, that the Bill was a proclamation of peace? Was it not really apparent that at the very best it created only a breathing space? The sections which had been responsible for war up to now were prepared perhaps to accept for the time being the proposals of this Bill. But every one of them—the Nonconformist, with the idea that the right of entry was going to be pared away either by non-practice or administrative obstruction—the Catholics, the High Church, the representatives of the Jews, each with ultimate intentions in mind—accepted it with the idea that as time went on some "intolerable strain" would make itself apparent and they were going to have a situation created precisely the same as before the Act of 1902. From the administrative and educational point of view there was nothing in this settlement fundamentally and essentially different from the state of things existing before 1902, and five or six years hence claims for special consideration would be made on behalf of the contracted-out schools similar to those which were successfully advanced on behalf of voluntary schools six years ago. He admitted what the hon. Gentleman said about educational progress in other countries, but he was not so sure that he was right about the relative position of this country. The more one understood and saw with his own eyes on the spot the reality of the well-advertised progress in Germany and America, the more one was thankful that he belonged to England and had the benefit of the English educational system in spite of its many drawbacks. He quite admitted that in some respects they might do very much better, but really after all, the religious difficulty was standing less in their educational way to-day than it had ever done before. It was real; it ought to be removed; it would be wise to remove it; but it must be done away with on some sort of a plan which would prevent contracting-out. Any system of dualism in education with one section contracted-out could not be a satisfactory or peaceful settlement. That was the fundamental principle which every Minister for Education must grasp before he proceeded to construct a policy which was to be a declaration of peace. He should like to summarise what, to his mind, were the chief points of this Bill, raising particular issues that ought to be discussed now, though there were many other points which would be debated during the Committee stage. For the first time Cowper-Templeism became statutory. It was not to be an act of grace by the education authority; up to now it had been that. And the curious thing was that a Liberal Government recognised parental right in this respect. Cowper-Templeism now was to be a recognition of the right of the parent to have his child educated in a particular creed at the expense of the State. That was a new proposition. It was a new proposition for the Liberal Party in particular, and it was condemned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer speaking for the Liberal Party in 1906 in a passage of such remarkable force that he was sure it remained clear in the mind of everyone who heard him. The right hon. Gentleman denied absolutely and specifically the right of the parent to have his child educated at the expense of the State. He said it was not in the book of nature and was not recognised by the law of the land, but it was so recognised in this Bill. His second point was as to the right of entry to all schools. This was really a surrender of all the classical principles of Liberalism, and his third had reference to the provision that the assistants might teach if they cared. They were told that teachers were protected against tests. Every Member who had sat upon an education committee knew that in the appointment of teachers there were always some members of the committee who knew what denomination the teachers belonged to and what position they occupied with regard to the various conflicting denominations represented upon the body, and he ventured to say they could put down as many paper safeguards to the rights and liberties of the teachers as they liked, and as they had done in this Bill, and they would all be dead letters in six or seven years, provided teachers were allowed to give denominational instruction. This simple proposal that assistants in schools might be asked to volunteer was the beginning of a new inquisition in a very subtle form. He objected to the new religious education committee provided for in Clause 7, and did not know why the clause was there at all. He did not think it was necessary to put such a provision in to enable the clergymen of various denominations to assist in drawing up a syllabus.

MR. RUNCIMAN was understood to say that if the work was to be carried on it was necessary to put this clause in.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said that with all due deference to the right hon. Gentleman he thought he was mistaken, but they would see about it when the Committee stage was reached, if the Government would be good enough to construct their guillotine in such a way that they could deal with it. His next point was that the contracting-out system destroyed all idea of unity. The hon Gentleman who had just addressed this House had said that it would be used to an exceedingly limited extent, but he thought it would be used to the maximum extent. He was told that the right of entry would not meet the desire of people who otherwise might wish to contract out. That missed the whole point. Those who would want to contract out were those who wanted an atmosphere in their schools; and three-quarters of an hour every morning was absolutely valueless from the point of view of religious instructors and people who wanted the religious atmosphere. If it was meant that religious instruction was a knowledge of the procession of the Kings of Judah that was a different thing, but if he sent his children to school for the purpose of being religiously taught and trained, three-quarters of an hour reading from the Bible would not fulfil that desire. Therefore, the right of entry did not meet the desire to contract out. What did meet the desire to contract out were the financial facilities. These the Government proposed to give in a substantially increased grant with the liberty to impose fees, and by so doing they imposed a premium on contracting-out which would be very largely taken advantage of. The one virtue of the Bill from his point of view was the single school area alteration, but that could have been secured in other ways. The core of the whole Bill—that part of it around which everything else was built up—was the right to enter. Take that away, and the whole Bill fell. That was why he was going to vote against the Second Reading. All the Members of the Government had said the right to enter now proposed was radically different from the right of entry proposed in 1906, and his hon. friend in referring to that very delightful expression that the right of entry would create pandemonium, tried to put some sort of meaning on it which he thought he would find he had not in his mind at the time. The extract was this—

> "He was violently against the segregation of children of tender age."

Were not children of a tender age going to be segregated by the right of entry as proposed in this Bill? If not, what was the use of entry? His hon. friend proceeded to say—

> "They would have them set aside in sections, and there would be pandemonium."

That was the position now. He cheered the hon, Gentleman when he made that statement in 1906, and he was appalled and amazed that he now tried to get out of it and delivered a speech in defence of a Bill which flew violently in the teeth of the position which he took up when he sat below the gangway. Every Minister, with one exception, had declared against the right of entry. There was one proudly consistent Member of the Treasury Bench who could indulge in an amplitude of self-satisfaction which was unusual in hon. Members who crossed from below the Gangway to take up responsible positions. The hon. Member for West Ham had always declared in favour of this and supported an Amendment in that direction in 1906. The party who were going to follow in his footsteps to-morrow night and declare that, after all, he saw more clearly and more accurately than their own leader did two years ago, only gave him three supporters on that occasion. Now they were told that they were all converted, and that for the sake of a peace that was no peace they were going to vote against their principles, against educational efficiency, and against proposals that two years ago they regarded as educational anathema. Why did they oppose the right of entry, and why did he oppose it now? They only required to quote Ministers' speeches. The first point was that it would create administrative chaos. They believed it would do it in 1906, and they believed it now. Their next point was that it was detrimental to the children. They believed it then, and they believed it now. Their next point was that it would militate against general peace. Two years ago hon. Members were cheering that very sentiment. The fourth point that they made use of in 1906 was that it would impose disabilities on those creeds which did not believe in accepting the facilities provided by it. That was to say the right of entry simply allowed creeds that believed in the right of entry to take advantage of it, and those creeds, like, for instance, certain sections of the Baptists and the old-fashioned Nonconformists who held firmly to their old notions of the relations of Church and State, would refuse to accept those facilities, and the right of entry was thus merely a selective process by which certain particular sects took advantage of the sects that held other views. That view was put forcibly and ably by hon. Members opposite two years ago. All these arguments had now gone. The Government were going to create what they imagined to be peace at the price of destroying administrative order, sacrificing the interests of the children, militating against the best religious spirit of the country, and imposing disabilities on those sects which did not believe it was in accord with their principles to take advantage of the right of entry. They did not oppose the right of entry as sectarians two years ago, but on educational grounds, and nothing that had happened since had changed that position. Every argument that they used then could be used now against it, and therefore the House was entitled to ask Ministers to reply to-morrow a little more accurately, and more in detail, not to the criticism that they might pass upon the Bill, but to their speeches which were only two years old. The position he took up was perfectly clear. He did not do this in a lightsome partisan frame of mind. He regretted exceedingly that he could not support the Government in the Second Reading of this Bill. He had always done it in the previous Bills, but this contained so much that was objectionable to him from the religious and educational points of view that he must vote against it. His final point, and he put it with all sincerity was this. He was deeply and sincerely interested in the religious life of this country. He believed that unless there was a better spiritual life among the people, they could educate them as much as they liked and make them as magnificent productive machines as they liked, but the country was not thus going to remain great and maintain its leading position in the world. He opposed all this make-believe of religious instruction, because it was destroying at the very root the best sentiment of their religious life. Over and over again they had challenged those who were in favour of denominational instruction to produce their results in the form of statistics. Let them examine the figures of crime. Had the scholars educated in the dead, immobile, uninspired, and uninspiring skeleton of their faith been better citizens? Had they had better manners? Had they done more than the board school children? Had they done more for upright, noble citizenship than these? No, they had not. Let them examine the statistics of juvenile offenders and they found that a mere drop in the bucket of the forces of civilisation was this miserable fraud which was imposed on the people in the name of religious instruction, the mere reading of the Bible and answering questions from the Bible for half-an-hour or three-quarters every morning. It was because he was so deeply sensible of the absolute failure of the present form of religious instruction that he begged and prayed the House to face the question of substituting something which was, perhaps, a little more heroic, although it might be a little more difficult. When hon. Members told them the secular solution was no good, and was impossible, he would remind them that every argument which was common to the right of entry and the secular solution was used by them two years ago against the right of entry. He wanted to lay the very greatest emphasis on the fact that this really was not religious instruction at all. The Archbishop of Canterbury and everyone else in this curious joint committee which was being formed, told them it was a guarantee that the Christian education of England was being looked after. God help Christian education in England if all they could do was to teach the children from the Bible for half-an-hour or three-quarters—a mere intellectual exercise. Because the Bill was opposed to education and religion, he should not vote in favour of its Second Reading.

Motion made and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*)—

Put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 26th November, 1908.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour of: of Primitive Methodist Churches at Shipley, Harrow, Wealdstone, Barnsley (5), Thurgoland, Garboldsham, Hopton, Hepworth, Worelwood, Foulden, Feltwell, Wilton, Mellwold, Brandon (2), Binbrook, Nettleton, Castletown, Port Erin, Port St. Mary, Colby, Ballasalla, Peel, Foxdale, Knocksharry, Glenmaye, Liverpool (4), Queen's Road, Bootle, Preston (7), Walmer Bridge, Leyland, Freckleton, Runcorn, Blackburn (3), Boughton, Huxley, Clotton, Tarporley, Ashton, Tarven, Chorley (4), Wigan (4), Sherington Vale, Standish, Aspull, Birkenhead, Seacombe, West Kirby, Billenge, Sutton, Southport (5), Banks, Hesketh Bank, Mere Brow, Oswaldtwistle (2), Accrington (2), Lancaster (3), Brookhouse, Caton, Barrow-in-Furness (3), Wrexham (5), Rhosadu, Warrington (2), Skelmensdale, Hall Green, Digmoor, Roley Mill, Clitheroe, Dalton-in-Furness, Millom, Askham-in-Furness, Swarthmoor, Haverigg, Elverston, Ellesmere Port, Whitby, Pooltown, Morecambe (2), Carnforth, Middleton, Orrel Post, Hindley, Lower Ince, Ince, Widnes (2); Sunday Schools at Orrell, Ellesmere Port, Liverpool; Pleasant Sunday Afternoon, Whitby; Worker's Band of Hope and Temperance Society, Liverpool, 106 Tents of the Independent Order of Rechabites; International Order of Good Templars at Cardiff, Moneyrea, Rothley; Sons of Temperance, Middlesborough; Temperance Councils at Gillingham, Tunbridge Wells, Dunstable, Batley; Pilley Wesleyan, Barnsley; United Kingdom Alliance, London; Meetings at Thame, Liverpool (2), Berry Narbor, Portisham, Minchinhampton; Inhabitants of Shipley; Independent Labour Party, Shipley, Congregational Churches at Newbury, Folkestone, Rochester, Marsh Green; United Methodists of Steeple Aston, Woodstock, Kidlington, Coombe; Holy Trinity Church, Leicester; Wesleyans of Esholt; District Free Church Council, Crosshills; Westcliff Road Chapel, Shipley; Women's Adult School, Wellingboro'; Baptist Senior Band of Hope, Ashford; Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Societies at Derby, Newbury, Shipley, Liverpool; Congregational Church, Foots Cray; Bands of Hope at Maidstone, Coxheath; Wesleyan Sunday School, Maidstone; Sons of Phœnix Centenary Lodge, Walworth; South Metropolitan Teetotal Society, Blackfriars; Meetings at Tythegstone Llangennech, Blaenavon, Cwmdare, Beaufort, Cymbach, Pentybont, St. Brides Major, Pentyrch, Llantwit, Llanddansant, Hirwain, Tonyrefail; Congregational Churches at Abertillery, Rhos, Ynysmudu, Portadawe, Trecynon, Ynysddu, Newbridge (Mon.), Llanhilleth, Brynmawr; Presbyterian Church, Abertillery; Calvanistic Methodist Churches at Llangathen, Rheuccilog, Pencoed, New Quay; Baptist Churches at Pen ell, Gran l Llanbister, Portadawe, Blaenau Gwent, Abertillery, Brymbo, Abercarn; Methodist Churches at Ynysddu, Blaenau Gwent; Wesleyans, Brymbo; Primitive Methodist Mission, Llwynypia; Thirty-one Lodges of the Independent Order of Good Templars; Temperance Associations at Portadawe, Llandilo, Carmarthen; Baptist Band of Hope, Portadawe; British Women's Temperance, Swansea; Sunday Schools at Portadawe (2), Ynysmuddu, Llanhilleth; Congregational Churches at Maesteg (2), Ruabon, Pwllheli, Gwereyllt, Beddgelert, Moss, Penygelli, Llithfaen, Abererch, Cardiff (5); Baptist Churches at New Tredegar, Maesteg (2), Cardiff (5); Presbyterian Churches at Cardiff (2); Primitive Methodist Churches at Ebbw Vale (2), Beaufort, Victoria, Cwm, Llanthewey, Aberdare, Rhondda (6), Trealand, Tonypandy, Gilfach Goch Pontycwmmer; Carmel Independent, Llangynwyd; Church Societies and Bethel Church, Maesteg; Memorial Hall Church, Christian Endeavour Societies (2), and Heath Wesleyan Mission, Cardiff; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Maesteg (2), Cardiff (3), Brookland; P.S.A. Society and British Women's Temperance Association (2), Cardiff; Sons of Temperance, Monmouth; Women's Total Abstinence Society, Folkestone; International Order of Good Templars, Maesteg; Meetings

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

at Tideswell, Pencoed, Llanwrda ; Congregational Churches at Gowerton, Guelsfield, Pennel, Pontrobert, Penllys, Sarnam ; Wesleyan Methodist Churches at Llanfyllen, Cymdu, Brew, Llynelys, Oswestry, Cefnblodwel, Llangynog ; Calvanistic Methodist Churches at Llanfyllen, Arddlien, Llandinam, Berriew ; Meetings in Shetland (7), Devon (3), Leicester, Ashton-on-Trent, Leicester ; Sunday School Teachers, Long Watton ; Local Preachers, Redruth ; Teachers, Guilds, Churches, and Meetings at Melbourne (3), New Sawley, (2) ; Meeting at West Pelton, Beamish, Leek, Walthamstow, Knighton, Leawick, Dunrossness (2), Levenwick ; the following Lodges of International Order of Good Templars : John Halcro, Pride of the Wear, Hope of Bootle, Temple of Peace, Central, The Dalton Castle, Kings Heath, Home Mission, Hope of Hurst, Hope of Sidmouth, Wincombe Conqueror, Burgess Hill, Standard of Freedom, City of Refuge, National, Pride of Dulverton, Star of Bethlehem, Peaceful, Canklow, Ingleborough, Hope of Darlington, Nechells, Bedfordshire District, North Devon District, Hampshire District ; Congregation of the Ashburton Memorial Church, Custom House ; Teachers and Scholars of the Emmanuel Baptist Mission Sunday School ; Members of the Emmanuel Baptist Mission Church, Levenshulme ; Manchester and Salford Women and Girls Institute, Levenshulme Branch ; Members of the Baptist Church, Devonport ; Inhabitants of the City of Leeds ; Citizens of Hackney, Bethnal Green, etc. ; of following Lodges of International Order of Good Templars : Eliott, Cotterell, Perseverance, New Century, Jubilee Excelsior, Henry Whitfield, Press Forward, Bright Water, Wincobank Happy Home, Charles Brook, John Wesley, Vale of Severn, South Metropolitan, Lily of Askam, The St. George's Rosebud, James Thornton, Staveleigh, Patricroft, Sparton, City of Birmingham, Northampton Meanwood, Margaret McCurrey, We are Winning, Welcome, Amity, Amethyst, Pride of Walton, Pride of Fulham, Harringay, New Ferry Welcome, Stanley Family Circle, Spurgeon, Deal, Orwell, City of Westminster, Chancton, Borough, Exeter P.S.A., Per Mare Per Terram ; Executive Officers of the Cheshire East and Mid District Lodge ; United Meeting of Good Templars held in the Town of Atherstan,, representing Lodges at Wigan, Leigh, Earlestown, Atherton ; United Meeting of Good Templars, held in the City of Leeds ; Inhabitants of Oldham, in public meeting assembled ; Churches, Schools, Meetings, etc. : At Castle Howard, Toddington, Birmingham, Croydon, Bootle, Newton Heath, Spring View, Dunstable, Grimsby, Walthamstow ; Calvinist Methodist Churches : At Givespyr, Stockport, Weston Rhyn, Pendenlwn, Pantydwr, Rhayader, Talybont, Talsarn, Llangefin, Paran Rhosneigr, Llangaffo, Brynsiencyn, Rhosygell, Llangwyry, Rhydlwyd, Taliesin, Rhyl, Rhosesmor, Gwernymynydd, Meliden, Caerwys, Maesydre, Lewisham, Buckley, Llynypandy, Ystrad, Mynach, Cwgglas, Pencoed, Resolven, Pontlotten, Dowlais, Maesteg, Trealan, Bethania, Treharris, Mountain Ash, Barry, Pontycymmer, Llansamlet, New Mill, Cardiff, Aberdare, Llanddausant, Myddfai, Carmel, Llansadwrn, Manordilo, Nantgaredig, Closygraig, Waen, Garregddu, Pennal, Dolgelley, Maentwrog, Aberllevein, Tyldesley, Bald, Caersalem, Rhosygwalian, Llanltyd, Barmouth, Cromyglo, Rhyd Dhu, drillo, Cefnddwysarn, Bontddu, Llanel Hyfrydle, Nevin, Carnarvon, Bodvean, Padoc, Pentir, Llanllyfi, Llandudno, Maestrafn, Ruabon, Ceiriog, Cerigydruidoin, Cefnberain, Ogosen, Trefnant, New Brighton, Bomere, Shrewsbury, Cefn Coed, Beaufort Hill, Crickhowell, Blackwood, Rhymney, Beaumaris, Ponkey, Rhosddu, Rutkin, Colwyn Bay, Turgwyn, Pydew, Dolgelly, Towyn, Aberdovey, Capel Neuadd, Penygarn, Penmorfa, Cenarth, Lanybryn, Penial, Tobythy Hwyth ; Churches, Meetings, etc., at Whitegrave, Reading (2), Castlethorpe, Poppleton, Stretford, Leicester (2), Ebbw Vale, Frome, Thame, York, Birmingham, Easingwold, Sheffield, Hockley, Reigate, Tarporley (2), Bristol, Fulham, Chorley, Barnoldswick, Tilehurst, Glasgow, Edmonton, Seven Kings, Honiton, Pontnewydd, Abercynon, Dunoon, Tunbridge Wells, Barlestone, Aylesbury, Leeds, Sheffield, Cwmfelmfach, London, Finsbury Park, Bethania ; Society of Friends : At King's Lynn, Norwich ; Guilds, Meetings, etc. : At Tarporley, Southsea, Castlethorpe, Marlow, Whitegate, Bradford, Burgh-le-March, Rechabites (8), Leicester, Dolgelley, Creswell, Worksop, Windermere, Barnoldswick, Halifax, Cyssgr, Sons of Temperance, London, Houghton-le-Spring, Fulham, Rechabites (51), Oldham Temperance Society, Good Templars. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Petitions against: Of persons signing (6); Bridge End; Rhondda Valley; County of Glamorgan; Licensed Victuallers Association of Newmarket; Gloucestershire. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

War Office Report on the steps taken during 1907 to provide technical instructions to soldiers to fit them for civil life. Presented (by command), and pursuant to Address of the 16th instant.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 4172. Austria-Hungary (Trieste). Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (URBAN DISTRICT OF HINDLEY.

Order made by the urban district council of Hindley, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for a certain class of shops within the urban district.

PUBLIC RECORDS, COLONIAL OFFICE (NEW ZEALAND COMPANY).

Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which have been removed from the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State having the Department of the Colonies and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Rules made by the Board of Trade, CLXII.—CLXXXV. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. [No. 232.]

LICENSING BILL.

Order of the day read for resuming the adjourned debate on the Amendment moved by the Marquess of Lansdowne to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2a, viz., to leave out all the words after "That" for the purpose of inserting the following words, "this House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill."

***THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY:** My Lords, I desire to support the Motion for the Second Reading of this Bill. The Bill was opposed yesterday by the noble Marquess who leads the Opposition and by others on account of what the noble Marquess called his rooted objection to its principles. I, on the other hand, believe its main principles to be right and sound, and though I should suggest modifications of detail, sometimes in one direction and sometimes in the other, to its main principles I unhesitatingly adhere.

I listened to the debate last night with a sense of the great, perhaps the unbridgable, difference between the way in which such a question as the reduction of public-houses is viewed by noble Lords—statesmen, central administrators of public affairs, students of abstract principles, practical men in the largest sense, who are able historically, socially, politically, and, I suppose, constitutionally, for privilege Amendments fall under that head, to regard such a question—the difference between the way in which they look at it, and the way in which it is looked at by men and women throughout the country who are engaged in facing day by day, and hour by hour, as their ordinary work, the problems of human sorrow, human weakness, human disease, and human sin, and who know them to be in a large measure the result of the multiplied temptations offered to the weak—temptations which this Bill sets itself in some measure to diminish if it can.

There will be, my Lords, heavy hearts and weary disappointment to-day among workers such as these, in whatever field their labour lies. I know that many of them had been looking for some cheering word of hope. They were expecting to hear that those whom they would, perhaps, describe as "the central people in London" would be able to do something to help them in what they feel to be a real need; and they will read that this House at least is not prepared for the present to do anything of the kind. I am referring to quite simple people who perseveringly work in the back streets of our great towns, or in hospitals, prisons, and asylums, and not least in our elementary schools, where the teachers and parents are in such close touch—people to whom such phrases as "privilege Amendments" would have no meaning whatever, but who are daily in touch and contact with the facts and needs and difficulties that your Lordships too, from a greater distance, and in a more general way, are trying to look at. These are the kind of people whom all of us, without distinction of opinion, would be sorry to sadden just now.

My Lords, I draw the contrast with no kind of idea of implying thereby a censure upon your Lordships' House. It is, of course, absolutely the duty of those who sit here to consider this and every other question in the largest and most far-reaching way. None the less the contrast is significant and it is an unhappy one to a good many of us. The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition spoke yesterday of the pleasure which would be given by the passing of a Bill such as this to "people who are passionately devoted to the cause of temperance." It is, in my view, less those enthusiasts whom it would please—some of them are very much disappointed with the details of this Bill—than other workers who may or may not have given themselves specially to temperance work, but who do know the everyday life of the tempted and troubled people whom legislation like this is meant to help. Petitions, memorials, and resolutions have flooded in upon all of us at this time. Put temperance organisations entirely aside—cut them all out from these resolutions and memorials—and look at the other signatories. See the schoolmasters, schoolmistresses, the nurses in parishes or hospitals, the rescue workers, the men or women who are associated with prison or asylum work, or with workhouse infirmaries and the like—eliminate all those who are directly and specifically temperance workers or temperance enthusiasts and look at the other people who know—and judge who are those whom the decision which this House seems likely to come to will distress. I have referred to those who want such a Bill and who support this Bill. A word about those who in the country are its chief opponents. The Prime Minister in his speech on the Third Reading of this Bill, spoke of the strength of the opposition which had been shown to it. My Lords, if by that strength, or vigour—I think that was his word—of opposition you mean its extensiveness, I am inclined to doubt its extensiveness through the population as a whole. The oppositon to the Bill has been, and is, in some cases, very strong—it is red hot—and those who have lighted or fanned the flame have used a gigantic influence. Sometimes the influence has been used in a way absolutely fair and perfectly reasonable, and with weighty, forcible arguments which those who feel as they do are not only justified in using, but, I think, are practically bound to use as honourable business men so that their case may be set forward as straightly and rightly as it can be; and there can be no doubt whatever—it is almost an impertinence to say it—that the ranks of those who are sometimes covered by the denomination of "the Trade" contain men as upright and as high principled, as kindly and as philanthropic, as any of their countrymen. Any one who denies that seems to me to miss a great deal of the importance of, and to be likely to lose a great deal of what might be effected in, the arguments which should be used upon this subject.

But, my Lords, the opposition to this measure, and to legislation of this kind, has of late taken a form sometimes which is less worthy of respect—perhaps less worthy of attention. I refer to the kind of representations which have reached some of us—at all events, some of us who sit on the episcopal bench—threatening either directly or indirectly, the withdrawal of support from religious or philanthropic work because Churchmen or ecclesiastics connected therewith are supporting a measure of this kind. Now, that seems to me a very unwise course of action on the part of those who follow it, because, in the first place, it must, in the case of any honourable man, stiffen his back and make him, perhaps, somewhat tempted to look less fairly upon the cause his correspondents advocate; and, in the next place, because it must undoubtedly lead one to look in a somewhat different way at the motives of those who hitherto have been subscribers to those particular objects. We believed they regarded those objects as wholesome and health-giving, and, therefore, worthy of support. If a man subscribes to a school, or hospital, or charity, or an institution of whatever kind, one likes to think he does so because he thinks it is a good sort of institution, and it does not become a bad sort of institution because some of those connected with it are supporting a piece of legislation of which that man disapproves.

This kind of reason seems to me to be unfortunate. It is, of course, totally different from the appeal made to us from many quarters, that owing to what are believed to be the disastrous consequences of this Bill, people will not be in a position to afford to continue their help; and a very large amount of correspondence has reached some of us of a simple and genuine and even touching kind from people who are under the belief that they will suffer so much by this Bill as to be unable to help forward causes which they have helped before, and that they will, perhaps, find themselves actually in penury and want. For such appeals and remonstrances I have the most cordial sympathy and the deepest possible respect. I have asked, not infrequently, on receiving such letters—Why is it that you think this will be the result?—and with commendable frankness I have received in several instances a draft letter which had been sent to my correspondent by the secretary of the association or company to which he or she belonged as an appropriate letter to be written. That may be quite right. The Secretary may be merely trying to help some person whom he believes to be placed in a difficult position, to express himself or, more often, herself in the kind of way which it is thought will be most effective, but at least it gives a slightly different character to the appeal which has reached us. I believe that opposition has been intense, is intense, and is genuine on the part of a very large number of people, but if I am asked whether I think it is very widespread among those who are not personally financially interested in these matters, either directly or indirectly, I say I have not seen anything to convince me that it is.

I pass to the provisions of the measure itself. It contains two great principles; it advocates the speedier reduction of facilities for excessive drinking and it advocates the securing for public authority of closer control over this particular trade. On the first it may be said, as a matter of course, that I and those who share my opinions are not speaking as though we thought there was something in itself wicked or wrong in the trade or in the consumption of alcoholic liquor. I hold no such opinion, and I take every opportunity of saying so. Then I would say I make no pretension that you can statistically show any absolute correspondence between the number of public-houses in a district and the amount of drunkenness. From the nature of the case I think it is practically impossible to compile such statistics with any probability of accuracy, because a great many other considerations besides those on the surface have, in every single case, to be taken into account. I can speak only of the general tendency in that way.

Does any one who knows the history of the last 200 years in England doubt that whenever there has been a large increase in facilities for procuring alcoholic liquor, a mischief has arisen which has, before many years have passed, called for some remedy? Look at the story how the drinking of spirits became common in England in the early part of the eighteenth century. Let any one read Mr. Lecky's "History of the Eighteenth Century" and notice what he says on that subject. In a century which contains the greatest exploits of some of the foremost statesmen and soldiers of our country, no incident was, in his opinion, of so great importance as the introduction of the drinking of spirits as a portion of the ordinary habits of the English people; and everybody knows how it was found before very long that measures had to be taken for dealing with that particular difficulty. Then, again, founded, I believe, on motives inclining to temperance, there was the legislation of 1830 promoting or advocating the universal spread of beerhouses; but it was found before many years had passed that the mischief was so great that it was absolutely necessary to revert to the earlier system, and to deal sharply and sternly with what had grown up.

But apart from that, does anyone doubt, speaking generally, that a great increase of facilities for the consumption of liquor is disadvantageous to the public good? Practically everyone agrees that a diminution is required, and the question is as to the degree of such diminution. The promoters of the Act of 1904 would be the last to say that they did not regard a steady and very large diminution in the facilities for the procuring of liquor as being eminently desirable. Your Lordships will remember that in August, 1906, Lord Salisbury speaking on behalf of the Government, said—

> "Under this Bill we propose to change the possible and occasional 200 licences [suppressed each year] into a constant number of nearly 25,000 which is an enormous change in the direction of suppressing those licensed houses that ought to be suppressed."

I never shared the fears of those who thought that under the Act of 1904 the suppression of licences would be insignificant; but, anyhow, it is very much less than was anticipated by the spokesman of the Government at that time. I think that I am right in saying that the suppression which has taken place under the Act is 1,096 a year in contrast with the expectation of 2,500. Anyone who knows financially what can be done under the new interpretation which has been given to the words of the Act will be of opinion that the reduction figures will be much smaller than 1,096 in the coming year.

The need of drastic reduction, moreover, can be justified for another reason. The argument is usually made to turn on the increase or otherwise of actual drunkenness; but the statistics take note only of those who reach the certain stage of helplessness. Excessive drinking is not the same thing as drunkenness. Let any one inquire of the doctors in the out-patients' departments of great hospitals, the police magistrates, the philanthropic workers, and the authorities of hospitals and asylums, and he will find that for one person who is there regarded as having rendered himself diseased or helpless by complete drunkenness, there are fifty who have never gone, perhaps, or rarely gone, so far as that, but who are from the excessive drinking in which they indulge day by day and week by week, impairing their powers to a fatal degree and rendering themselves practically unfit to be considered responsible citizens. It may be said, and probably will be said, in answer to me: How can Parliament help that? You cannot forbid a man to judge for himself. Certainly not, and I make no claim on Parliament of such a kind. But indirectly Parliament can do a very great deal.

Excessive drinking comes from excessive temptation to weak men and women, who are practically unable to resist it. This arises from the constant competition of one public-house with another, and from the desire of the tenant to push forward his trade and to stand well with his employers. We are told that the drunkard is the worst enemy of the publican. It is true, but the man who stops just short of actual reeling drunkenness is his best friend. How can Parliament help that, it may be asked. I say quite frankly, not at all by direct action, but it can help by lessening the temptation. We try, for example, to meet excessive gambling by legislation enacted with almost universal consent; we endeavour to repress impurity and other wrong-doing by making it more difficult, as far as legislation can help, for people to go wrong in this particular way. What the Bill is trying to do is not simply to meet the case of actual drunkards, but by indirect pressure, and without unfair limitation of the legitimate demands of the public, to diminish temptations which grow until they are practically irresistible to the weakest class of the population.

Therefore it is that I welcome the restraints and the restrictions which the Bill contains, provisions diminishing the number of public-houses, restrictions on Sunday hours of opening, the closing on election days, the checking of the absurdity of the *bona fide* traveller, and, above all, the restrictions imposed in respect of the supply of liquor to children. I welcome also, as far as they go, the rules laid down for the regulation of clubs. I realise the extraordinary difficulty of that particular problem. But I was a little surprised last night to hear the Leader of the Opposition referring with some reproach to the Bill because it did not go further in respect of clubs. That feeling of surprise is natural when I recall the arguments put forward in 1902, telling us to be very careful not to go too far, otherwise we should do harm. The Bill will render impossible at least the substitution of the tied club for the tied house. That, to my mind, is one of the very best clauses in the Bill. I should like to see those clauses go further; and if the Bill had gone into Committee I should have been prepared to suggest further Amendments which would be neither unfair nor unreasonable.

The second great principle of value in the Bill is the securing fuller public control over the whole licensing system. I care comparatively little about the details relating to the mode of reckoning compensation or the actual length of the time-limit. I care comparatively little for these things, important as they are, provided we can secure that some day before very long public authorities shall have complete control, unhampered by permanent vested interests, in dealing with this matter; and, secondly, that in doing that they should act with real fairness and justice to those interests, of whatever kind, that are thereby affected. I have no sort of wish that we should act unreasonably, but I claim and prize the restoration of magisterial control. Up to 1904 the magistrates had, under certain restrictions, a fairly free hand, but now their power of control is virtually destroyed. That power of control this Bill would restore, and I am absolutely certain that in the public interest some Bill or other must before very long be passed to restore the powers of the licensing magistrates.

But I hope for a great deal more than that. I look forward in the coming years to developments and experiments of all sorts in our licensing system and in the management and character of public-houses; but the moment we endeavour to start to bring about changes of that kind we are met by the permanent vested interest which stands across our path, the vested interest of those who want things to remain as they are. It is because I desire above all things to see reasonable liberty of action restored that I welcome the endeavour which this Bill makes in that direction. It is surely beyond question that some day a reasonable date must be fixed after which the community at large, the State, should be able to act freely in this matter, to enforce its own conditions, to impose its own price for the monopoly which its own licence confers. But the moment you say this, the question arises: On what principle can you get rid of existing rights and interests in this matter? I suppose it is true that in strict law, prior to 1904, a bench of magistrates could terminate an existing licence without cause assigned, or any compensation whatever being given. I have always said, however, that the reasonable expectation of renewal had become a species of property the owner of which must in some way be compensated if you take it away. I regard it as fundamental that we should recognise that principle and act with fairness. But that the State should in some way or other get back into its own hands the power of acting with freedom seems almost too plain to require argument.

People talk as though for the first time in legislation we should be lowering the value of investments. It is quite a novel doctrine that, because that result might inevitably, however regretfully, follow, that because investments made in recent years, in perfect good faith, might be diminished in value in consequence of legislation which for the public good Parliament enacted, such legislation ought not to be passed. We talk as though this were quite a novel bit of legislation. On the contrary it has been happening continuously throughout the modern history of Parliament. Take one great example—the abolition of the slave trade. Not a penny of compensation was given when the slave trade was abolished. Noble Lords seem to think otherwise. Is that disputed?

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: Indeed it is.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I must, then, point out to the noble and learned Lord that my statement is absolutely true. No one supposes that the noble Lord would confuse the abolition of the slave trade with the emancipation of the slaves. The emancipation of slaves cost some £20,000,000, but the slave trade was abolished twenty-five years before, and not a penny of compensation was paid. Just one hundred and one years have passed since a memorable debate took place in this House upon that question. A Bill was moved in this House for the abolition of the slave trade, for rendering it illegal that ships should be used for that purpose, and rendering the slave trade practically impossible, at all events in British ships. The Bishops of London and Durham were the principal advocates of the Bill in this House. The Bill went to the House of Commons, and petitions were sent in against it from citizens of Glasgow and elsewhere, and counsel, in support of these petitions, were heard at the bar of the House. And what was the nature of their petitions? The petitioners said that they had invested a great deal of money in those ships, that widows and orphans all over England had invested money in those ships and in buildings for the embarkation and debarkation of slaves, and that they would be terribly injured by the loss which would fall upon them by the proposed legislation. They further said they had invested their money in the confidence that Parliament had time after time recognised the existence of the slave trade by the regulations it had made, as well as by Royal Charters, and that, therefore, they had an absolute right to expect that if the slave trade were abolished, and the ships and buildings rendered useless, they should have compensation. I am not going to say whether they were right or wrong, but Parliament gave not one penny of compensation, because the proposed legislation was said to be for the common good. It was not denied that the property of all those shareholders would be diminished in value, but it was pointed out that there was no direct taking away of property which belonged to individuals. When, some thirty years later, the Legislature said they were going to take away property—the slaves—which absolutely belonged to individuals, live goods and chattels, the conditions were different. There was an actual purchase of these slaves who were to be set at liberty by the State, and for that compensation was paid up to £20,000,000, notwithstanding the admitted grossness of the evil which was to be set right. Happily there is no close analogy between what we are now doing and what it was then necessary to do. The slave traders got no compensation. Here, in the case of the liquor traffic the case is different; and we desire to act in a generous spirit. We desire to give compensation in the form of a time-limit, and to do it much more generously than has been the case in America and elsewhere when licensing legislation of a corresponding kind has taken place. I understood the noble Viscount opposite (Lord St. Aldwyn) to say last night that by the 1904 Act we made the present licence-holder pay something like a monopoly value by a compensation levy for the benefit of those who were losing their licences. In my opinion that must be something to which a limit must ultimately be set. The question is one of degree and not of principle. I desire to do it with absolute fairness, not only because that is reasonable and right, but also for an indirect reason. It is desirable that we should act with absolute fairness in order not to bring about disastrous consequences on the general sense of security of commercial investment. I am going a little out of my depth in touching on such a subject, but the general financial security of investment ought not to be shaken in the slightest degree by any action taken in this matter.

Now, my Lords, I have tried to show why I believe in the two great principles of the Bill, the reduction of licences and the restoration of genuine and effective public control. I have alluded also to what the Bill contains of a directly effective temperance kind, the promotion of the better conduct of public-houses and the lessening of facilities for the consumption of drink in different ways; and I was specially struck by what was said last night by Lord St. Aldwyn, that it is possible that even yet a Bill containing these clauses might be rescued from the wreck. I should be very grateful to the Government if, before we close the debate to-night, or to-morrow, they would say how they would regard such action taken by myself or any body else in the endeavour to do something of that kind. I feel we ought to have some assurance upon the subject, if we are invited to make such an attempt.

I ask your Lordships once more to look round the country as a whole and to consider the trend of public opinion in this matter. I ask you to consider gravely and carefully who they are who are in favour of such legislation as this—workers of all sorts among the weak, the sick, the tempted, the needy, ministers of religion of all sorts and of all denominations; then there is the practical unanimity—and to this noble Lords may give greater or less weight—of the Labour Members who are in the closest touch with that part of the population which is supposed to be most directly affected. What organised forces do you show on the other side? Are they or are they not forces that are in touch with the country's needs and are trying day by day to remedy its troubles and its evils? I think they are not. My own wish is to be absolutely fair and just. I am not in the least bound to particular figures, to particular processes or to particular dates; but I do profoundly regret that we are to be given no opportunity of discussing these matters in detail, and I deplore the fact that the House of Lords should, on an occasion such as this, place itself in the position of taking what I believe thinking men hereafter will unite in regarding as the wrong side.

THE EARL OF **HALSBURY**: I confess I had hoped when the rev. Prelate began his speech that we should have had something in the nature of a disclosure, which has not yet been vouchsafed to us, of the mode in which the Bill which he recommends for your Lordships' adoption would operate to effect the objects which he, in common I think, with every member of your Lordships' House, is anxious to secure. I confess that in one respect I am very much disappointed. The most rev. Prelate described the disappointment which would be felt all through the country—and I have no doubt truly described, because he spoke of what I will venture to call the uninstructed multitude who have not seen the Bill and who, as he himself very candidly admitted, would not have understood it if they had, but who are nevertheless deeply impressed by the evils which he has described—if your Lordships rejected an amending Bill, because they were in some way concerned in the interests which certainly were not those to which the most rev. Prelate referred. I want to make a little protest at first. The most rev. Prelate himself is the very last person to have suggested that his antagonists, because they disagreed with him, were not actuated by motives as pure as his own, and he has disclaimed on his own behalf the extreme view which treats the dealing in this traffic as itself wicked and wrong. But he will forgive me for saying that those who speak so candidly and kindly as he did, and with so unprejudiced a mind upon the subject, are a decided minority of those who are insisting upon this Bill.

I must protest against its being supposed that on this side, either this side in politics or this side in the House, we are less anxious for the temperate and proper distribution of what is, in a great measure, one of the important foods of the people. We have a right, I think, to have our views considered as impartially as those of the most rev.

Prelate, and our view has been throughout in regard to this Bill that it was not a Bill for temperance at all—and, indeed, the most rev. Prelate has to some extent admitted its two-fold character—but a Bill which was intended to enlarge the area of taxation and to take from one very large portion of the population property which belongs to it and to vest it in the State. If it is possible for such a Bill as the most rev. Prelate has foreshadowed to be brought in and to be the proper subject of discussion, my impression is that it would be received with open arms on both sides of the House; but it is because the cause of temperance has been weighted, and deliberately weighted, with the other sections of the Bill which bring with them the confiscation of property that we are unable to discuss the question of temperance by itself or to say in what way we would, if it were possible, interfere with the freedom of action on one side and the proper repression of excess on the other.

One proposition laid down by the most rev. Prelate is a proposition which gives me very great cause to think what sort of Bill he contemplates. He has pointed out with force that great mischief is done by excessive drinking, but drinking which does not proceed to drunkenness. Does he suppose that there is any mode by which you can curb the approach of vice in that way by law? Except there is some outward and visible sign of what has made a man a nuisance, what mode does the most rev. Prelate suppose he can adopt for preventing people drinking too much? I will come in a moment to what we are dealing with, viz., the public sale of liquor; but upon the abstract proposition, how does he suggest we are to deal with the point I have referred to? The law can only apply the outward test, because you cannot prevent a man being vicious in this sense, if he has either eaten or drunk too much, and I believe it is a very prevalent opinion among persons who have studied that subject that more disease is engendered by overeating than by overdrinking. If you are going to legislate against vice, simple vice, that which does not disclose itself in public or is not made the subject of observation in public, you are undertaking a task which is beyond the reach of human legislation altogether.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: That is almost exactly what I tried to say. Legislation cannot do it directly. It can only be done indirectly by the diminution of temptation.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I am not quite sure that I quite follow the relevancy of the topic. Does the most rev. Prelate intend to suggest that you can only proceed by indirect means, and that the indirect means are to be applied to the public sale of liquor, and its distribution and manufacture? I thought that what the most rev. Prelate was referring to, but I am quite prepared to be corrected, was that he could not be expected to give evidence of the mischief done by the public-houses, because the best friend of the public-house was the man who stopped short of being drunk, and that he was in that way accounting for the inability to prove by evidence that the public-houses were encouraging drunkenness. I understand the relevancy of the argument completely, but I am afraid I cannot follow it now, because the only way by which we know of the mischief done by the public-house, the only way by which the law can take hold of it, is that people get drunk there. If they do not get drunk there what is the difference between the public-house and the private house where people, whether they get drunk or not, have no right to be interfered with? The most rev. Prelate has taken the Bill under his protection, not because he has established any usefulness in that direction, beyond the broad proposition, which, I admit, he laid down, that the diminution of public-houses is to the advantage of temperance. That, from the beginning to the end of his most interesting speech, was the sole observation he made to establish the fact that this was a Bill promoting temperance. My Lords, I can only say that I am an absolute disbeliever in the connection that is supposed to exist between the number of public-houses and intemperance, and I am encouraged in that belief by the Home Office Report of 1907 on that subject. If there is this supposed connection between them one would have expected something would be demanded by the operation of the new Bill which would apply itself to that connection. So far as the diminution of public-houses and its operation is concerned, in 1904, at all events, there was this connection, that there was a power of selection, and the power of selection was carefully confided to those who would be most likely to be able to form an opinion on the subject. But this Bill destroys entirely that power of selection. It takes it away from those who are able to exercise it, and substitutes what might be indeed described as a mathematical or arithmetical procedure, which may have no reference whatever to the particular circumstances of a particular case. I have myself had reason to know what has been the care of magistrates in such matters. I believe, speaking generally, they exercise their discretion with great propriety. But unfortunately, I think at one time they got a notion that there was a policy to be adopted, and a policy which was, I think, somewhat irregularly exercised. The Bill of 1904, I think, became a necessity in consequence, and accordingly it was passed. In dealing with a question of this sort, when you bring in a Bill reversing in a great measure the Act of 1904 and establishing a new system, I think it is incumbent that you should show where the Act of 1904, which you are practically repealing, has failed. It has indeed been asserted broadly that that Act was a failure, but I do not believe that that has been established. It appears not by the evidence of its authors only, but by the evidence of chief constables and others, that the Act has worked very well and that the results have been very good, and I have not been able up to the present to understand what it is that has rendered it necessary for a new Act to be brought in to remedy the alleged defects of 1904, which, to my mind, have never been proved.

Now, my Lords, I want to express my deep sympathy with the great number of persons who have written to me on the subject of this Bill, and I have no doubt there will be mourners amongst those whom the most reverend Prelate described. But that which they have assumed as one of the cardinal propositions upon which they have urged me to support this Bill, is the fact that it will greatly diminish intemperance. But how? I have over and over again asked that question, and beyond the broad proposition which we have heard about the diminution of public-houses, no one has ventured to explain. The noble Earl who spoke last night, was good enough to say that he would not go into all that. That is one of the difficulties. We have not heard what the proposition is. But the noble Earl was good enough to say that the working man spent a sixth of his wages in drink. In the first place, I should like to say that, in my view, beer is part, and an important part, of the food of the working man, and I believe most people who are familiar with working men, particalarly those engaged in certain forms of work, know that that is the fact. I see *The Times* this morning works out the sum spent in drink at 6d. a day, if a man is earning a guinea a week. Well, I do not know, if a working man requires it, that that is a very extravagant part of his wages to spend. At all events, I should like to know who was the wage earner referred to, what his form of work was, and whether he had any calls upon him which rendered that extravagant. But there again you are to go into the question of a man's family. Apparently the ideal worker is the man to whom the State will dictate how much of his wages he may spend in drink, how much in other things, and, if he is a married man, with a family, how much he must distribute to them. But the noble Earl will forgive me for suggesting that when he says one-sixth of a man's wages are spent in drink, that does not answer my question at all as to how you are going to make the working man abstain from so consuming a sixth part of his income, and in what way this Bill does that. My Lords, I really am reluctant to leave the question of how much this Bill will promote temperance, because I believe that that is the cardinal question upon it, and the question that should be considered by those people who are going to mourn over your Lordships' decision.

But the question we have to consider is not only that which, as I have said, has been allowed to pass without discussion, without proof, and without one single fact being laid before us to show that the passing of this Bill would diminish the intemperance of any human creature, but the question which the most reverend Prelate has described as the resumption by the State of that to which the State has a right. I have not the least notion what that refers to. I have seen it written and I have heard it said, but I do not know to what it refers. What is the right of the State? Is it the right to carry on a trade? Is it suggested that in this country we must ask the permission of the State to carry on a trade; because a right to regulate a trade, a right to prevent its being a public nuisance, to prevent its being in any way injurious to the State, is one thing, and the right to carry on the trade is another, and a very different thing. I should have thought it was part of the liberty of every one of His Majesty's subjects to carry on a trade, and I think that would become a cardinal question when we consider the question of what is called the time-limit. My Lords, I deny any such right. I am not at all aware that it has ever been claimed. There are some monopolies which the Government claimed and has retained. But what right has ever been suggested in the manufacture of the beer by the brewer, or by the growing of the barley by the farmer? All those go to form a great manufacture, and once upon a time, indeed within the memory of many of us, it was a most common thing for a great number of people to brew their own beer, not to sell at all. A great many of the colleges and other institutions and private farmers had breweries. Gradually it was found that both better and cheaper beer could be obtained by a company setting up a brewery. And so it became a great trade, which has been established by an enormous capital. Some of the fanatics to whom the most reverend Prelate referred I take it must include in their virulent denunciations both the farmer and the hop-grower. But the rev. Prelate has admitted that it is a lawful trade, and it would be impossible to deny it. There is a reference in the Statute-book, going back to 1660, showing that it has been a lawful trade for centuries, and treated as a trade belonging to the people who have created it, and not to the State.

What is now proposed to be done? What is it that is to happen at the end of this period of fourteen or twenty-one years, or whatever the period is? To my mind it matters very little whether the period is one or the other. The principle is the thing that one has the right to complain of, and that principle is, as it appears to me, that the State is going to resume what it is pleased to describe as what it has given away. It has done no such thing. As I have pointed out, the trade has grown up like any other trade, under the sanction of the State, in the recognition of the fact of its being a lawful trade, and now it is supposed that you can cure the injustice of taking it away by saying: "We will give you notice that after a certain time we are going to take it; up to that time you can make what you can by the proper exercise of your trade, and at the end of that time we will resume it." As a practical question I should like to know what is going to happen, not only with reference to the injustice to those from whom it has been taken away, but in regard to what you are going to do. Is the State going to carry on the business of brewers or publicans? No one has answered that question. It has been asked a great many times but nobody has told us; at present, so far as I can see, it is left for exposition. In the first place, this is an example of a trade being taken away from different members of the State, and absorbed by the existing Government. That is not a popular view. But if you are not going to do that, what tenure are you going to give your tenants? Are they to be allowed only a year's tenancy; and if so, are they going to be allowed a proportionate portion of this, that, or the other district, within which to exercise what, in that event, may be a monopoly? My view of what has been described as a monopoly is a very different thing. The duty of the magistrates in licensing was to see that there was a due supply in the neighbourhood for the convenience of the public. That is not a monopoly at all, because if the neighbourhood increased the proper course for the magistrates was to increase the public-houses in proportion as the public convenience required. It is the oddest notion of monopoly I ever heard. I protest against the notion of the resumption by the State of what they have never parted with. They have only done that which it was their duty to do, viz.: to regulate in respect to the convenience of the neighbourhood, the needs of the neighbourhood, the health of the neighbourhood, and I quite agree, the morality of the neighbourhood. But that power of regulation gave them no right of property that can be imagined. I am reluctant to say anything which may seem to refer to what I have said as a Judge. I have seen myself quoted over and over again, and I will only make this observation. I have nothing to retract or qualify in what I have said. I adhere to every word of the judgment which is so constantly referred to. But I must say this: that it is neither right nor just to take a piece out of a Judge's judgment and to refer to that as if it were the whole of it, and that is what I have seen constantly done.

My Lords, I confess I heard with very great admiration Lord St. Aldwyn's exposition last night. I desire to add nothing to it. I believe that what he said was both sound law and good sense, and I would make my own every word he said on that subject. But it appears to me that the attempt now is to take away property and to take it away in such a fashion as will prevent its proper valuation being obtained. That seems to me to be grossly and scandalously unjust. It is no light matter with which one is dealing. We are here, certainly, for the purpose, as the most reverend Prelate says, of doing what we can for temperance and for morality. It is a bad start in dealing with the question of morality to take away what does not belong to you, and to treat with such absolute indifference the rights of others. I have nothing to say about what the most reverend Prelate said in respect of the ownership of these different places. But he will allow me to say that he is singular in the fair treatment he has given to that question. It is talked of as if there had been a sort of gambling speculation in entering into this trade, and that now people were only disappointed that they had not got the complete result of their gambling. That is absolutely untrue. In what I am about to say I will not give names, although any Member may have them privately if he wishes to verify my statement. I have taken three London breweries and examined the capital consisting of the debentures and the preference shares. The capital, taking the three of them, is £6,750,000, and what I want to draw your Lordships' attention to is the mode in which that capital has been supplied. It is the capital of three breweries in London only, and I need not say what the inference derivable from this is, if you consider what really is the capital employed over the whole country. The sources from which that capital of £6,750,000 is derived are:—Trustees of various settlements, £3,559,545; clergy, £66,322; women, £819,421; others not included in either of those classes, £2,804,000. We hear a great deal about the brewers and the persons who have made great fortunes in brewing and so on. Is that capital, typical of the trade all over the country, to be seized on? Is the effect of your legislation to be such that you are to disregard the ruin that you will cause many of the persons in those trusts and other classes? It appears to me that dealing with such capital is a very serious responsibility; but I do not think that is the most serious side of it. What do you think the effect upon the credit of the country will be? That is a matter which affects everybody, not only the persons immediately concerned, not only those who will have been turned from reasonably well-off persons into persons of a different class and condition. But what very seriously affects the question is the mode in which this is regarded by others, the mode in which you can invest in anything. One has heard of the enormous fortunes established by brewers and so on. These figures seem to me to show, and I think it would be shown in the same way whatever area you took, that what has been done has not been violent, mad speculation, but that trustees and clergy and women who had no other provision, applied to get a safe investment, not one which returned enormous profits but which offered a safe investment; and where would they be when this termination (it is a delicate word) of their interests is determined on in 1923 or 1930? I cannot help thinking that those who devised this Bill had not only something in the nature of temperance theories, but had to pay off an old grudge against what they suppose to be the extremely Conservative side of the trade in this country. And I cannot help saying that I remember that in speeches on that subject in Birmingham, it was pointed out that the trade was throwing itself into one side of politics, which might at no very great interval be in power; and that they would find out that they had made an enemy of the most powerful party in the country. That threat has been held over for some time, but now it has reached its fulfilment. For myself, I cannot do better, I think, when we are dealing with the compensation which is supposed to be shared out, than apply myself to a quotation from one whose name will be received, at all events, with respect on that side of the House. The quotation I refer to is—

> "We ought not to allow a prejudice with regard to this particular claim or our sense of the enormous evil associated with its working, to cause us to deviate by one hair's breadth from the principle on which Parliament has always acted in analogous circumstances, that is to say, where there is a vested interest allowed to grow up, the question of compensation is to be considered whenever that interest is interfered with by Parliament."

The words are those of Mr. Gladstone.

I should like to say one word about the supposed analogy to which the most rev. Prelate treated us. I misunderstood him at first. The loose use of the word "slave-trade" may lead to misapprehension. The "slave-trade" was abolished without compensation, but slavery did not exist in this country. It had been held to be illegal, and when the property in slaves was being dealt with, it was compensated for by a very large sum of money. I do not think the analogy is a very forcible one. It was an illegal thing to hold a slave in England, but in the Colonies it had been allowed to grow up, and this country was willing at immense sacrifiec to render it illegal in the Colones. But although people had detained these slaves by means which certainly could hardly be defended, even in the extreme case, this country would not abolish the property in slaves without granting ample compensation. I have only to say that what seems to me to be the vice of this attempted legislation is that it disregards the rights which have grown up, that it attempts to take possession of and to claim property in a trade to which the State has never laid claim before, and to do that in defiance of rights which have grown up and which everybody has regarded as what the State itself was bound to respect; and it seeks to do this in order to increase the area of taxation as well as nominally to assist temperance in this country.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: My Lords, I shall not attempt to follow the noble and learned Earl in the arguments which he has addressed to the House, partly because they have been essentially legal, and in any polemic with regard to a legal question I feel how entirely I should be at a disadvantage with the illustrious Judge who has just sat down. My object is a much simpler and a much narrower one. It is, in the limited time at my disposal, to express as clearly and as succinctly as I can my individual reasons for giving a vote for the Second Reading of this Bill—a vote which I give without the slightest hesitation and without the slightest doubt, a vote, not for all the details of the Bill, but certainly for the fundamental principle that underlies the Bill. I do not think there is any one who, in so vast a measure as this—too vast, if I may humbly offer a criticism upon it—would be prepared to give unhesitating approval to all its details. I very much doubt if any member of His Majesty's Government would be able, *in foro conscientiæ*, to give full approval to every detail of this enormous measure.

There has been one or two points to which exception has been taken in this House, and with that exception I feel considerable sympathy. There has been the point raised by the Bishop of Bristol in the interesting speech which he made last night as to the question of clubs—whether they have been sufficiently dealt with where public-houses have been so strictly dealt with. There has been the question of boards. There, I confess, I thought the remarks of my noble friend the noble Marquess were not unjust and were not ill-applied. It has been too much the practice of this Government to place in the centre of their Bill, whatever Bill it may be, a well-paid board which is to fulfil the functions that we hoped local bodies were competent to discharge. That is the flaw from the Liberal point of view, and I think a grave flaw, and I wish that my noble friends would, in their measures which I wish to support, avoid imposing on us any more of this bureaucratic *regime*.

Then there is the question of the sparseness of the public-houses in rural districts. There, again, I was in agreement with the noble Marquess. I do think that would be a great grievance. No one in this House, I hope, no one except a fanatic outside this House, wishes to deprive the poor man of his beer. The labourer in the country has, after all, but few enjoyments and few solaces in his dreary life. The one great advantage that he does enjoy, the purity of the country air, he does not in the least appreciate, and I, at any rate, should feel very sorry if I was going to vote for a measure which tended in any way to narrow and to stint the legitimate enjoyment of the working man. And, again, I do not think that the introduction of local veto was either necessary or advisable in this measure. But all these were points, if not for dealing with in Committee, at any rate for negotiation, and I confess I do regret, and I think that everybody who has the interests of temperance at heart, to whatever party he may belong, will, in his heart of hearts, regret that this great opportunity for settling this question is, apparently, about to be lost, and that no opportunity will be given either for revision in Committee or for negotiation.

The great principle, after all, that we who vote for the Second Reading are voting for and emphasising emphatically is the principle of the time-limit. My noble friend Lord St. Aldwyn, in his speech last night, which, as usual, displayed that masterly grasp of principle and detail which distinguishes him—in the last sentence of that speech, which he will excuse me for imagining, up to the last few sentences, was a speech in advocacy of the Second Reading of this Bill, jibbed suddenly and in a startling manner at the time-limit. The time-limit is the principle in this Bill. It is the principle which all who vote for the Second Reading have at heart, and, if the noble Viscount cannot swallow that principle, it is quite clear that His Majesty's Government cannot claim his vote.

There is something in this discussion which we have gained, and that is, I think, a certain amount of common ground in discussing this question. No speaker has alleged, and no Member of this House has even thought of desiring, anything but what he in his heart believes to be the interests of temperance. Temperance is on every tongue. It is, I believe, at the back of every mind, and that admission which lurks behind and below our discussion is, after all, a great admission. As against the Bill as an instrument of temperance we have heard a great deal. Everyone on this side of the House appears to think that it is not likely to promote temperance. The Bishop of Bristol, I confess, astonished me by the original position he took up. He confessed himself an almost fanatical teetotaller. No drop of alcohol ever crosses his threshold; no member of his family or household ever touches it. And yet he cannot vote for this Bill. Why? Not because there are not an enormous number of provisions and clauses in the Bill of which he approves, but because it does not deal sufficiently drastically with clubs. I ask, with all reverence, was there ever such a case of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel as a right rev. Prelate voting against a Bill on such a narrow issue as that?

As regards this question of temperance, I myself do not profess to be so versed in the great populations of our cities as to be able to say whether this Bill will in reality promote temperance or not. It is not easy to say of any Bill what it will promote or what it will not, whatever its aim may be. But I do look to the great body of expert opinion which is ranged in favour of this Bill. I do not profess, on every secular subject, to accept the guidance of the right rev. bench, but I do say that their practically unanimous support of this Bill, not merely because they are bishops sitting in lawn sleeves on red benches, but because they are men who have worked in the great parishes of our towns, does weigh with undoubted authority.

I think the noble Marquess discounted a little the temperance addresses and votes that are sent up from every quarter of the country in favour of this Bill as an instrument of temperance. He said they were apt to be mechanically produced. I do not deny that political resolutions have been and are and will be mechanically produced, but I do say that, by every feeling of the pulse of the country that we can obtain, we are convinced that that great section of the country which has temperance as its main object is profoundly stirred in its enthusiasm by the provisions of this Bill, and that is a fact which none of us can lose sight of

But I will give my noble friend the temperance associations, the temperance party. I will admit, if he chooses, for the purposes of argument that they are engaged in a strife to the death with what is called "the trade," and that they dislike the party opposed to them, which they think is wrapped up in the trade. I will give the noble Marquess that body of public opinion, though I myself attach the greatest importance to it. But you cannot say that the bishops have any sinister motive in advocating this Bill. You cannot say that the whole body of the clergy of the Free Churches, who are, I believe, practically unanimous in favour of this Bill, can have any sinister motive and interest in promoting it? You cannot say that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood, who also, I believe, give a disinterested and solid support to the measure, or of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and of Ireland, who also give a united voice in favour of this Bill. And, therefore, though I admit I am not able by experience to forecast what the temperance effect of this Bill will be, I cannot overlook the enormous strength of the spiritual, disinterested, unselfish mass of opinion which backs it as a temperance measure.

While I feel that, I do not deny that I rather share the view that was frequently expressed by the late Lord Salisbury that you cannot look for an improvement of intemperate habits merely to legislation or even mainly to legislation. It must come from the moral elevation and improvement of the people. It does not follow from that that we should neglect the mere mechanical and legislative methods. I believe it is common ground that a licence in strict law—I emphasise the words in strict law—confers only a twelvemonth's interest, and that it can be terminated by a ruthless and intolerant State at the end of that twelvemonth. From that, however, I deduce the conclusion that it is madness and suicidal to identify the cause of property at large with this annual licence as if it constituted a freehold licence. If I were a Socialist—which, thank God, I am not — and wanted to attack property, there is nothing in which I should rejoice so much as identification of the cause of property with the cause of the annual licence in drink.

And here I come to ground on which I shall find more sympathy with noble Lords behind me. We all admit that by the negligence or the policy of successive Governments—and the negligence rather than the policy—an equitable or a traditional interest has grown up beyond the strict law, which may be called the expectation of renewal in the case of good conduct, which cannot be ignored. The State itself has not only not ignored it, but has made a pretty good thing out of it at times. I am at issue with the Government as to the inferences to be drawn from the imposition of death duties. It was argued last night that the State only levied death duties on the present value of objects which might decline or increase in value. It might be a share or a racehorse, and no one knows better than I the varying value of a racehorse as it passes from a position of unrivalled triumph to one of complete decrepitude. But there is a fundamental difference which has been missed by all who have argued this question of the death duties. It is that the property on which the State is levying the death duties it might take away and be actually intending to take away within a few months. The State, even in its most impassioned robbing of hen-roosts, will not expect to find a racehorse in them. It is impossible to say that in every case the State can intervene in any possible contemplation of removing all value from the share or from the racehorse within a few months of its levying full duties on its highest possible value. If you wanted any establishment of the fact —which, perhaps, you do not—that there is a real traditional value beyond the strict legal value of a licence, you have it in the case of the death duties.

Let me take an analogy which, I think, holds good. Just before the great Reform Bill Sir Mark Wood sold Gatton Park to Lord Monson for an enormous sum of money. The value of the park was relatively a small part of the price, but it had, as an essential part of it, what the auctioneer used to call the elegant contingency of the power of returning two Members to the House of Commons. I rather think the Reform Bill was in sight, but it was less than two years before the passing of the Reform Bill. Supposing the State had sold Gatton Park to Lord Monson and had at the same time both the will and the power to take away the principal part of its value, surely his Lordship would have had some right of recovery from the State, and it would have been felt that the State, in the language of slang, had been playing it rather low down. I think we cannot deny that when the State levies duties on the full, though transient, value of a public-house, it has acknowledged an interest which has accrued to it which is far beyond the legal interest, and, indeed, if it did not do so we should not have had this Bill, or the Bill would be of a totally different nature, excluding all allusion to compensation and not requiring a time-limit.

My Lords, the State by its negligence or apathy has allowed this interest to grow up, and in strict logic it should pay the compensation, or most of the compensation. It has allowed and tolerated this understanding—it has almost encouraged it—and why should the burden be laid on others which is due only to that amorphous being which is called the State? But that is outside the region of practical politics. In the first place, the State could not afford to do it. We had a lurid picture from a noble Lord from Wales last night as to the state of our national finance, but it struck me as pale compared to the reality; and with £180,000,000 ear-marked to Ireland—that highly blessed country—and with a deficit of £25,000,000 or so in sight, it would be ridiculous to propose to any practical Assembly the purchase of public-houses by the State. Nor would it be permitted. No one can deny that at present the great temperance party, which was so powerful as to prevent Lord Goschen's object being carried into effect in 1889 or 1890, would be equally strong enough to prevent any such proposal as that being carried into effect now. I only mentioned it as showing what, in my opinion, is the logical deduction from the facts I have mentioned, and I, therefore, dismiss it.

We must seek another way, and we fall back on the principle of the time-limit. It is not a very new principle. Lord Peel and his minority recommended a very much shorter limit than is laid down in this Bill, and it was brought forward, though without a clause relating to compensation, in this House in 1904 by Archbishop Temple, who received substantial and valuable support. I think myself that there is much—everything—to be said as apart from a money compensation, though in this Bill they are coupled, for an exhausture of the interest by efflux of time. I do not much trust analogies, but if I had to offer an analogy to the position of the licence-holder it would be that of the squatters on an estate who have been tolerated by the owner—who have been told they might remain for another twelve months, but who are without a legitimate or prolonged tenure. And surely in a position such as that you would be dealing very liberally with the squatter if you said: You must go in twenty-one years, and for twenty-one years you shall remain free and undisturbed. I entirely agreed with my noble friend, Lord Ribblesdale, when he said last night that the trade had had fair warning. My noble friend Lord St. Aldwyn extracted from that speech many other admissions which were concealed from me by the golden haze of autobiographical reminiscences. But I do think that my noble friend was right in what he advanced on that point. The action of the Liberal Party before, at the time, and after the passing of the Act of 1904 must have shown the trade that there was a great party in the State, sooner or later certain to come into power, which did mean to deal drastically with the trade.

My Lords, I come to the question of why should the State resume these rights. I venture to say that there is a most overwhelming ground for more than one reason for resuming those rights, as I must continue to call them. In the first place, it is the first and the necessary step in any real policy of temperance reform in this country. Until the State resumes the rights which it has allowed to be weakened and almost to expire in its hands, there can be no effective reform having temperance for its object in this country. And remember this, that every year that passes with the present state of things undisturbed and unremedied strengthens that interest as against the interest of the State. The second reason is this. The State has lost, is losing, and must lose until it resumes its control of the vast monopoly value in licences in the United Kingdom. Here I must observe that my noble and learned predecessor in this debate was unable to understand what rights the State had and what was meant by a monopoly, and what there was to resume. He said that it was like any other trade, like the grocer's trade, for instance, and that the State had no right to interfere. I never thought to live to hear such a doctrine as that announced from so responsible a quarter.

What is the foundation of all this property? It is the annual licence. What would the property be worth without it? Its value as a dwelling-house or as a warehouse, or whatever else for which the building is fitted. The difference between these two values—the value of the house as a place of resort for drinking purposes, and the value for any other purpose—is the value which is given by the State annually when it confers that licence. My noble friend asked: "What is this value?" I will give him an illustration. There was a licence granted in London, and the man who received it was offered £18,000 for it before he left the hall. The State, for no consideration, practically presented that man with £18,000. He wisely refused the offer, and sold the premises for something nearer £80,000. That is the sort of interest which the State has been allowing to run to waste during all these years, and which my noble friends in the Government are attempting to stay and to resume. You may say that the man who got the licence had to pay duty on the liquor which he sold; he had to pay a licence duty; he did not get it for nothing. Of course he did not; but he knew that he would have to pay duties on liquor, and that he would have to pay for a licence; so what he was anxious to pay £18,000 for was the privilege of selling these duty-paying liquors, and he was also paying for this annual licence. When you consider the financial position of this country, as described by Lord St. David's last night, and to which I might add a few touches if I had leisure, it does seem a most unfortunate circumstance that successive Governments should have contrived to allow so vast an increment and so huge a property to escape.

Then there is the third point on which I hold it to be necessary that the State should recover its interest in these licences. It is, to my mind, the gravest of all, and it goes the deepest of all. It is only by that means you can reduce to its proper position that vast influence which grows and is growing, has been and is growing, and will soon be far too powerful for the State. My noble friend did me the honour to quote words of mine uttered many years ago, and to which I adhere in their fullest extent. If the State does not control the trade, the trade will control the State. What is that power? Eighty per cent. of the houses in England are tied houses under the influence and at the disposal of a certain number of great members of this trade. When you realise that every public-house is a centre of social life and action in its neighbourhood, as well as of great political influence, you can conceive what this power is which in the interests of the State requires to be limited and controlled. One portion of its interest is entirely opposed to the interests of the State. I do not believe the trade wants drunkenness. Drunkenness injures the trade. But the trade naturally wants drinking—drinking short of excess; and in that respect, and as far as it goes, the interest of the trade is opposed to the interest of the State.

That is the smallest part. It interferes at every point and in every fibre with your political and your municipal life. I do not care with which party it is identified. It seems to me to be a matter of comparative indifference; but the trade is generally supposed, and I believe rightly supposed, to support the Conservative Party. I say that this trade, from my own observation, and not with a desire to reflect on my excellent friends engaged in it, poisons the very sources of your political and municipal life. It poisons your political life, because the persons engaged in it, when it comes to a general election or any particular election, ask themselves, not what is the best for the Empire, not what is the best for the public, but what is the best for the trade. In municipal life: no one can have been engaged in municipal work for any time or almost in any community without seeing that candidates are chosen not with reference to their character, not with reference to their purity, but entirely in deference to their subserviency to the trade. I do not believe that any one who has been intermixed with the public life of this country will dispute that grave allegation; and I venture to say that it is in the public interest, in the highest public interest, that this drinking should be brought within measurable size, and brought within the control of the State.

These are the broad and deep grounds on which I should cordially vote for the Second Reading of the Bill. But there are some main purposes of this measure on which I ask leave to say a few words. It may be said—and I think it was said by the Bishop of London last night—that the rejection of this Bill will close the era of temperance legislation, and that it will be long years to come before anything will be effected in this direction. I do not share that view. I think it is almost in some ways a view less pessimistic which I take. I believe that we are only at the beginning of a long vista of years of legislation on this subject, legislation on the part of those who promote temperance, and legislation on behalf of those who protect what they believe to be property. It will also have an embittering effect on the cause of temperance, and on the trade itself it must have a most disturbing influence. Sometimes it will find itself in a state of dejection because it will not know what party is coming into power and what it may effect in legislation. Though I for one am no champion, as will be seen, of the trade as a whole, and though I respect many of the individuals engaged in it, I do regret that any great commercial interests should exist subject to the constant alternatives of competing and warring legislation.

This may go on, but I think that I know what will happen. The nation will grow impatient, and will say: "We are weary of this fooling; come to an understanding; we must have this settled by the co-operation of both parties in the State; a settlement we must have." That has happened, or is likely to happen, with regard to education. How many Bills have each side introduced with regard to education in the last few years; how much time have they wasted of both parties? The State will not tolerate these interminable polemics, and it demands that the question should be settled on the basis of the common-sense view of the community at large.

If you review the course of social legislation you will see that that social legislation only endures which is founded on a compromise. Political legislation and political laws which are placed on the Statute-book, irreversible and irremovable, and indeed the whole history of social legislation, are the result of compromise, That is why I look with a favourable eye upon this measure. When I was the Chairman of the London County Council there were some gentlemen of moderate opinion on the body. One of the stoutest and most stalwart once rose to his feet and said: "Mr. Chairman, I 'ates compromises." That is, I believe, the feeling of stalwarts on both sides, perhaps more grammatically expressed. I myself, sitting on the cross benches, do not view compromise with that aversion or with such horror as my friend of the London County Council. I hoped that we might have passed the Second Reading with a view to a possible compromise.

I know the noble Marquess said the other day that the interpretation of privilege in another place had rendered the task of amending the Bill in Committee extremely difficult for this House. In the history of compromises which I can recollect in this House it was not always necessary to be barred by privilege. There were such things as overtures between the two sides of the House, intercommunications, negotiations. Those were most fruitful during the controversy in relation to the Irish Church, when Her late Majesty did not disdain to intervene and when the father-in-law of the most rev. Primate played so distinguished a part. I confess I hoped from the speech of the noble Viscount last night that there might be some idea of compromise in the air. Have my noble friends (pointing to the front Opposition bench) approached the Government in any way to find out what they are ready to yield, what they are willing to concede, what they regard as vital, and what in the opinion of all may be preserved in the Bill? If they have not done that they have not exhausted the political resources of which they are the masters. I deeply regret it. I think you are missing an opportunity of settling this question on broad lines which may not easily return.

After all, we in this House all want practically the same thing; all sensible men in this country want the same thing. We do not wish to deprive anybody of necessary comfort, solace, or enjoyment. We do wish to do away with degrading drunkenness which is the curse of our nation, and the curse not merely of themselves but of their posterity on whom will devolve in time the burden of Empire. If I may borrow the phrase of Archbishop Magee, we wish to see England not merely free, but sober also; not merely sober, but free, because the drunkard is the greatest slave of all. If you miss this opportunity of settling this question, the time will come, I hope not long hence, when the nation itself will insist on your factions coming to an agreement, will insist on the waters of politics not being disturbed by this noxious and troubling question. Whatever may be the Government under whose *régime* this reconciliation may take place, sure I am that in God's own good time it will come. When it does come it will of course redound to the honour and glory of the transient Government in power, but it will redound infinitely more to the glory of both the great historical parties which shall have condescended to drop their issues and come to an agreement on a subject so far-reaching and so vital.

*LORD ROBERTSON: The noble Earl has told us that in his judgment the principle of this Bill is the time-limit. It is that which fascinates him in this measure, and apparently his devotion to the time-limit is such that he is ready to support it with or without compensation, that he regarded it merely as an accident that in this measure there was compensation. Now, I commend to the attention of the many who regard the noble Earl as a rallying point of moderation on the Liberal side this most recent exposition of his principles of social economy. I must own that I heard with great surprise various of his developments. Apparently his object is, whether this measure be one really to promote temperance or not, to pounce upon the liquor trade profits, and he singularly enough gave an instance of the enormous mistake the State is making in not getting hold of those profits by telling us that in one case in London £18,000 was the price of an off-licence. I could not help wondering if the noble Earl realised in his own mind that the reason why that £18,000 should be offered was that the offerer relied upon a renewal, and yet this is the class of man whom the noble Earl considers it appropriate to call squatters, and of whom he says they have no right whatever, except mere tolerance, to enjoy the possession.

I have heard with great interest, and, I must own, some surprise the cavalier way in which the noble Earl disposed of the case of his friends on the matter of temperance, because he tells you that he, for his part, regards it as an open question whether this Bill will promote temperance at all. He is convinced it will, only because the clerical element tells him so, and he says: "They know much more about it than I do, and no doubt they are right." I believe he overrates the concurrence of the clerical element in that opinion, and I am well informed that throughout the country there is a very strong feeling to the opposite. But I want to point out to the House that in this very eminent supporter of this temperance measure there is a complete scepticism on the subject of its curative power, and what is more he, like many of your speakers last night, is content with merely the title of the Bill—that it is a Bill about temperance—and then he proceeds to invoke all sorts of sacred interests to warn us of the terrible danger we are running in going against the temperance interest. We heard something like that during the course of the debate last night. What we are always told is: "You must do something; it does not very much matter what, but do something, and at all events avoid the grave responsibility of rejecting what is called a temperance measure."

Last night we had a most distinguished instance of that process of reasoning. In naming the Bishop of London I name an old friend, and speak of him with the utmost reverence and affection, but is it not the case that I accurately describe his speech when I say that in the exordium there was a blaze of statistics about the drink bill, but that when it became necessary to prove by experience and fact the main proposition about this Bill, that it would reduce the amount of excessive drinking, he had recourse to tropes and anecdotes and that statistics vanished. The Bill is said to be one to diminish excessive drinking and drunkenness. Does the closing of a public-house, of one public-house, stop that drinking which has taken place in that public-house, or does it divert it? When questions of that kind are put a most engaging spirit of courtesy and tolerance comes over the speakers on the other side. They say: "We do not dogmatise upon that subject." I have looked into such statistics as are at hand upon this subject, and I will do no more than say this, that the statistics are equivocal; in some places the result is favourable, in others it is neutral. I am confirmed in my suspicion about this being a foregone conclusion, and not the result of experience, by the entire absence of any material placed before either House of Parliament, and also by the scepticism expressed by the noble Earl who has just sat down, although on this, as on other subjects, I should prefer a more stable guide.

And now I am going to speak from a point of view which I am afraid will not commend universal assent in one part of the House. I want to ask the authors of this Bill what is their theory of the proper place of the public-house in the social economy of this country. Do they desire to wipe out all public-houses, or do they desire to improve and regulate them? Now it is a very remarkable fact that not once in the speech of the most rev. Prelate, not once in the speech of the noble Earl who introduced the Bill, was there the smallest reference to what I may call sober drinkers. The public house, as sensible people must allow, has its use as a club for poor people. A great many men, far the greater proportion of men in the country, go there for their sober glass and for English jollity, and it leaves no bad taste behind, and I am amazed that men who profess to study the interests of the working classes take no notice of that vast class of the community.

I put it to the Government: "What are your views upon this subject? Do you consider it right that there should be a progressive annihilation of the public-house, or do you consider that the public-house has its proper place in the social life of the country?" I am quite sure that at all events some Member of the Government, remembering the serried ranks of teetotalism in the other

House, would be a little afraid to tell me that they intended to preserve the public-houses. But this problem, which is ignored in this Bill, is one of the most salient problems in the temperance question, not merely in relation to clubs and off-licences, but in relation to the general enjoyment of the people of this country; and whether it is popular or not, my position is that I will consent to no legislation which spoils the jollity of English life, and prevents the poor people having the same rights as we have.

May I put it in this way? I know there are exceptions, but most of us meet together at dinner parties or what not, and enjoy our wine and our spirits. Could we face the poor people in the country and say: "That is very good and right for us, but we will shut the doors of houses where you can enjoy similar pleasure?" I go further. Unless you mean to abolish public-houses altogether, you have a duty, not merely to the publicans, but to their customers, to secure that the publicans are decent and reputable, and how can you expect a decent, irreproachable man to engage in that trade if he is liable to have his property taken from him at six months notice? You cannot evade this question. I know what is said, for popularity's sake, about the immense importance of reducing the number of public-houses, and up to a certain point I agree. Redundant public-houses are a nuisance to everybody. But the duty of the State is never to lose sight of the fact that publicans are the ministers and agents of social pleasure throughout the country. You will pounce upon them if you like—you do it at your peril—but your duty is to see that they are treated on such terms as will ensure their living reputable and respectable lives. For that reason I am dead against creating an insecurity in the tenure of those people. The commonsense of Englishmen has put that question upon the, I admit, somewhat illogical, but very intelligible, footing upon which it now stands. The Legislature has shown by enactments that the man who holds a licence and has presumably proved that he is well qualified to hold it, shall continue to hold it; and the practical result is that there has grown up that expectation of renewal which, observe, is founded upon good conduct, for good conduct is a necessary condition of renewal. That expectation has grown up and is one of the assets of the man's life. I am not going to join issue with the lawyers, amateur and otherwise, who like talking about "freeholds," and this being no property. In every relation of life every person who has to deal with the man who held such a position recognises that he has a commercial interest in it, and I need hardly say that in transactions to which the Government have been party they have recognised that, as in the case of the "Coach and Horses" at Portsmouth. But I am not going to indulge in personalities or *tu quoques* on a subject so grave.

I hope I have made it clear that whatever other people may say I am in favour of giving these men such expectation of tenure and security as will ensure that the right men are attracted to the business. May I say one word upon the Act of 1904? I think that Act has been very greatly misunderstood, and has led to a good deal of confusion in debate. The Act of 1904 did not enable justices to do what was unlawful, but reminded them that in the course of lawful administration they could put down houses on account of redundancy. At the same time there was made a compulsory insurance among those who were likely to profit by the cessation of one of the houses, and the person who lost his licence should be compensated, if you choose to use the word, out of that fund. Now, observe, the essential difference between the proposal in this Bill and the Act of 1904 is this, you are legalising what would be illegal without this Bill, It is illegal for magistrates to draw up a fine schedule about a proportion of population to area and say "We will act upon this; it is desperately clever, it is a very fine scheme and we will act upon it." They could not have done that and that is the essential difference between the two cases. In this case you are taking from these men that asset which I have described, a commercially valuable asset in their property. You are taking that from him, and I say the logical result is not that you should also take part of his brother's, but that the State should pay for it. It is one of the merest commonplaces of legislation that the State, if it takes a man's interest, property, or anything you like from him that is worth money, it shall pay for it, and accordingly I denounce this measure as one which does wrong to persons having valuable pecuniary interest and takes their property from them for nothing.

Now I am going to say something which is, perhaps, very bold, but the most rev. Prelate has almost challenged it. The most rev. Prelate mentioned in his speech—a matter of which I had never heard and of which I entirely disapprove—about people writing to the clergy and saying that if the bishops support this measure they will withdraw their subscriptions. I hate and detest anything of the kind, but I am aware of this, that there is a deep feeling of disappointment that in what seems to many people a clear case of right and wrong, the course is being taken by the bishops that is being taken at present. I think many honest people who make no profession of being better than their neighbours but are sound, good men, are shocked that it should be considered the height of Christian heroism to take joyfully the spoiling of the goods of other people.

I have spoken ot the direct attack upon these men and I need hardly do more than incidentally remind you of the gratuitous insertion of a double-barrelled scheme of local option. Here, again we are on matters of principle. I will never consent to a majority of ratepayers deciding upon whether a man shall have his drink or not, and it is peculiarly odious that the teetotalers amongst the middle class should determine the diet of the poorer classes. I hope that a strict account will be taken between political parties, and between Minister and Opposition, upon questions like this, and I say to your Lordships you need never fear if you interfere on this occasion to prevent not merely spoliation but an indirect attack upon the liberty of poor people to enjoy themselves as they like. I have assumed that people have a right to convivial enjoyment, and not the less because they are poor.

I am quite certain that any measure of temperance reform will find warm support on this side of the House; any measure which takes the publican by the hand, recognises his responsibility, supports him in his responsibility and induces him and his proprietors to better the houses, and make them more attractive, to introduce more amusements, and more amusements will divert from drink. But I am not going to make the pretence of associating myself with the fulsome flattery of teetotalers which has been too much in the air during the last few months. The worst of this Bill is that when one examines the clauses he finds not the hand of the philanthropist at work, the hand of him who will consider the needs of men, their propensities, their tastes and their traditions, but through every clause you see the scowl of the teetotal lecturer. Your Lordships have had various exhortations addressed to you as to your duty on this occasion. I think that converging towards my noble friend's Amendment are various streams of tendency in modern politics which are irresistible. I will never believe that we shall be wrong when we stand up to resist direct spoliation, I believe we shall not be wrong when we stand up to resist the tyranny of a majority especially over poor people, and I will rejoice when the time comes when we can go to the country and ask them which of the two Houses best represents their views.

*VISCOUNT HALIFAX: I rise because I wish to correct what might otherwise go forth as a grave misapprehension. The noble Earl who spoke just now seemed to imply that the whole of the clergy of the Church of England were of one mind in support of this Bill. My Lords, that is not the case, and I will appeal to the most rev. Prelate, and I will ask him whether it is not the case that at the Representative Church Council which met in London last year, there was not a very profound and grave division of opinion in regard to the support of this Bill, and whether the gravest apprehensions were not expressed, both by clergy and laity, as to the effect of this Bill in regard to temperance. I think the most rev. Prelate will not deny that fact. There is one other point I wish to mention, because it comes within my own personal experience. I have had some experience of the mining population in the north of England. Close to my home at the present there is about to be opened one of the very largest coal-pits and a model village has been built for the convenience of those who will work in that pit; there are thousands of persons now inhabitating this village. Do your Lordships know what is the most earnest desire of the best part of the population in that village? It is that a respectable public-house may be opened in that village in order that something may be done to neutralise the effect of the clubs which are the very curse of the population. I am acquainted with a man who has given his whole life to working among the mining populations in the North. He is a man of great ability, he is a man who does not agree with me upon many things, but it is impossible to know his work without knowing how admirable it is, how entirely he has devoted himself to the working classes and also how much confidence they repose in him. He said to me only the other day when I happened to meet him: "What are you going to do in regard to this Licensing Bill, because I am most sincerely anxious that that Bill shall not pass. Among those with whom I work, a well-managed public-house is distinctly to the advantage of the population. It is the clubs that are the curse of my people and these clubs are largely increasing. The trail of the serpent is over most of them and I am quite satisfied that the effect of this Bill will not be to promote temperance, but it will be to promote those clubs which are the source of every sort of evil-drinking and every kind of mischief to the population." My Lords, I know that man is right.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM: I wish to associate myself, speaking with the knowledge I have of the feeling of Birmingham, with what was said by the most rev. Prelate when he spoke of those large classes who have the best and most intimate acquaintance with the habits and needs of the people who will be deeply disappointed if your Lordships did not give this measure a Second Reading. I had the honour of presenting yesterday, at the Table of this House, an immense petition of many thousands of signatures got up in Birmingham by the Citizens' Council for promoting the passing of this Bill; I hold in my hand an analysis of the classes in that petition, and there is one fact to which I want to draw your Lordships' attention. It is that among the signatures to that petition are the names of 1,176 school masters and school mistresses. That testimony is, I think, a very important witness coming from those who have the most intimate acquaintance with the habits and the needs of the people, of the children and of the parents.

I should like leave to say a few words, first of all, with regard to what was said by Lord Robertson as to the motive which underlies this Bill. We desire, he said, to wipe out all public-houses. We have no regard for the needs of the sober drinkers. He said that the most rev. Primate had said nothing about the needs of the sober drinkers. If the most rev. Primate did not enlarge upon that it was, I suppose, because he could not conceive that anyone would suppose that he had not in view the needs of the sober drinker. Indeed, he explicitly said that he desired to make room for the better provision for the needs of all those who might want to indulge in moderation in the liquors which are the subject of this special legislation. A great deal has been said in this House about local option. I am not able myself to conceive what principle there can be which justifies a landlord in excluding all public-houses from his estate, which justifies a trust like that which controls the great area close to Birmingham, the Bournville Trust, in excluding all public-houses from its estate, and then goes on to say that it is a serious infringement of human liberty that you should allow the vast majority of the inhabitants to do the same. But that is not, I must admit, the line along which I desire myself to see the country moving. If I may use a phrase which has not infrequently been used with regard to another subject, I wish to see public-houses mended and not ended. In Germany and also in other foreign countries I have been in the public-houses, and I have seen great numbers of the working classes with their wives and families, engaged in what appears to me to be purely innocent merriment and conversation, drinking their beer or coffee or those curious substances which children drink, the constituents of which I have never been able exactly to discover. At any rate there you see a delightful scene, and again and again I have asked myself why have we not public-houses like that in England. It is the reform and not the ending of public-houses that I desire. But if we then ask what is the need for a Bill of this kind I reply it is because it is the existence of the present system which renders any such great and vital change in the whole idea of the management of public-houses impossible, and I am quite sure that if there is to be in the future any such desirable change it is only because the country has been able to give notice that after a definite interval of time it is going to institute a quite different system of running this necessary but also most dangerous trade.

There is another subject upon which I want to say a word. It has been said very often that you cannot make people moral by mechanical rules. It is only two nights ago that I heard a very remarkable testimony from one of the ablest of the evangelical clergy in the East End of London, the Rev. Watts Ditchfield, who related a very interesting and remarkable experience showing a reason why those who hold the evangelical faith should take deep and profound interest in social conditions and social life. He said he had gone to the East End of London desiring to preach the evangelical faith, and he had found by an experience which he could not possibly resist, that the way to those moral and spiritual changes he desired to promote was barred by the social conditions. Having gone there with the desire to preach the evangelical faith and not having ceased from that desire for a moment, he had come to the conclusion that the way to open up the road for that faith was to be found in pressing forward those kinds of social reforms of which a change in our licensing system was the first.

This is not a perfect Bill, no doubt, and yet I venture to think that a good many speakers in your Lordships' House have greatly underrated the number of points in which this Bill does very greatly promote temperance. These are some of the minor points. One of the greatest evils in the diocese of Worcester, over which I used to preside, was in the traffic in spirituous liquors on passenger steamers on the Severn. There is a clause in this Bill which deals with that traffic. There are others which deal with the distribution of liquor from vans, with the closing of public-houses on election days, and with the diminishing of the number of public-houses. I feel a profound conviction that your Lordships can only give a true impression of your attitude towards this Bill if you give it a Second Reading, and then proceed to amend it on those points in which it is faulty, whether it be as to the scale of compensation or as to the grocers' licences or as to the dealings with clubs. I am sure that the attitude of your Lordships if this Second Reading is refused will be very gravely and seriously misunderstood by that part of the English people with which I have opportunity of being acquainted.

There are two chief points in this Bill; one is the reduction in the number of public-houses and the other is the time-limit. In regard to the former it has been questioned whether there is any need for such a reduction or whether it would be any good. I am inclined to reply that, if there is no need for the reduction of public-houses, what in the world could have been the meaning of an Act that was passed by His Majesty's late Government which had for its main purpose and end a reduction of the number of public-houses? In regard to the time-limit I am certain that, at least in that part of the country with which I am acquainted, your Lordships' action, if you do not give this Bill a Second Reading, will be interpreted as meaning that you assent to the claim of the licensed victualler to regard any time-limit of any number of years as an act of confiscation, and I really can conceive no more serious disaster than that your Lordships should give your adhesion to this tremendous extension of a claim beyond all law and equity. There has been a great deal said about death duties, but there is one thing which, in my audacity, I sometimes feel a desire to press upon the attention of those who use that argument. It seems so often to be supposed that the Government, in regard to death duties, does something in particular in regard to a particular trade, whereas I suggest it acts only on a general principle, and I have observed that in dealing with any class of the community the action of the Inland Revenue is nothing else than to demand as much as they think they will be able to get, and to leave it to those on whom the demand is made to resist it if they think more is asked than they ought to be required to pay. I am informed that there are very large numbers of business men who pay a great deal more than they need pay simply because they do not choose to reveal the actual state of their business, the fact that their returns are diminishing; so that the Inland Revenue goes on demanding and they go on paying. I often wonder, supposing those who are interested in the business of the trade had united in representing that it really was a monstrous thing to deal with a licence as if it were more than an annual licence, if they had united in representing that they were being dealt with as having a freehold when, in fact, they hold only an annual licence, is it not very probable that that united representation would, if not directly then indirectly, have brought about a reduction of the amount of the claim which the Inland Revenue could have made. But it does not appear to me on inquiry that they have ever made any kind of resistance to the Inland Revenue dealing with their property on the basis on which they have done, and is there any reason at all why they should suppose that they should be dealt with differently from any other class of the community in this respect?

But the matter which seems to me to be of chief importance from this point of view is that here those who are interested in the trade have made a claim in which is an unwarrantable extension of the rights of property beyond strict law and equity, and it seems to me to be of the deepest importance that we should not sanction that claim. I cannot understand how it can be denied that a property for one year, plus the expectation which has been allowed to grow up, is exactly what can be met by due and sufficiently long notice of an intention to terminate the present arrangement. It seems to me that, if the claim of the trade is to be justified, the State ought to have given some sort of assurance that it never intended to alter its licensing system. Instead of any such assurance the trade has had repeated warnings from the days of Mr. Bruce's Bill that it was in the highest degree probable that after a certain time the State would bring to a termination the expectation that had been allowed to arise on this annual licence.

The noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, said something about there being no one who would have occasion to rejoice if your Lordships assented to the claim of the trade in this respect except the Socialists. My Lords, there are two kinds of Socialism. There is the Socialism prescribing a specific economic theory as to the abolition of private capital, and in that sense, as an economic theory, I do not suppose it has any very considerable hold on this country, and I sometimes wonder whether it is advancing. But there is another kind of Socialism. The word is often used to describe the state of mind of those who feel that the industrial developments of our country in the last fifty years have represented individualism run mad to the detriment of the interests of the whole community, and that we have got to re-assert the claim of the interests of the community under which alone property has been allowed to grow up and consolidate itself; that we have got to re-assert the interests of the whole community over the claim of individual property, and I am sure there is a vast body of moderate reformers in this country, moderate social reformers, who are deeply concerned, not to defend the theory of economic Socialism, but to guard against the unwarrantable extension of the rights of property.

It seems to me that if in a special way this House stands for the rights of property it is of the greatest possible importance that your Lordships should not sanction, and confuse with the legal and equitable rights o property, an extension of the rights which is neither legal nor equitable. I am persuaded that there will be a profound and wide-spread sense of disappointment and distrust if your Lordships do what you will be understood to do if you fail to give this Bill a Second Reading—sanction against the interests of the whole community an unwarrantable claim for the extension of the rights of private property beyond their strict limit.

LORD BELPER: My Lords, having taken some little part in the guidance of the Bill of 1904 through the House and followed that up by having considerable experience of the administration of that Act as chairman of the licensing committee of my county, may I ask your attention for a few moments? I am one of those who have had grave hesitation about the course that is to be pursued with regard to the Second Reading of this Bill, and I confess that I should like to have had the Bill discussed in Committee, where we could have tested how far those statements which have been made with regard to the injustice of the principal clauses of the Bill are true. More than that, I should have liked to have seen some chance of the latter clauses of the Bill being discussed, because I believe that those clauses, if they were made more effective than they are, would perhaps have done more to promote the cause of temperance than any of the heroic clauses in the first part of the Bill. In the first place there has been very much said in this House to prove that a stringent amending of the Act of 1904 is necessary. When I ventured to interrupt my noble friend Lord St. Aldwyn when he alluded to the fact that he did not think the expectations of the promoters of the Bill had been fully carried out, it was because I had seen a circular sent around by some temperance society which stated in categorical terms that I had, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, stated that the number of licences which would be done away with under that Bill would be about 2,240 in the course of the year. As I pointed out to my noble friend I made no statement of that sort. I expressly avoided, representing the Home Office as I did, attempting to prophesy with regard to the numbers which would be done away with by that Bill, but I did say that if the compensation was an average of £500 per house, that would be 2,240 done away with, and I went on to add further that if the average was £800, then there would be 1,500 houses done away with in the course of a year. If I am charged with having made a false prophecy of the Bill, at all events I can claim that the latter part of my statement was very near what has actually taken place under the Bill, 1,500 having been done away in the year and the amount I named as compensation, £800, is certainly somewhat the average of those houses that have been done away with in my own county.

With regard to the administration of the Act, I do not think anybody who has watched it, at all events, in the cities, would be able to bring the charge that it had been administered unfairly in any way. There was an organised attack made on the provisions of the Act on the ground that they were going to take away from the discretion of the local magistrates, and the Quarter Sessions were to have the power of revising the decisions of those magistrates. Let me give my experience in my own county. In dealing with all the houses that have been done away with, I cannot recall more than one instance in which the decision of the local magistrates was over-ridden by the Committee of Quarter Sessions, and in the particular case, it was obvious that the first decision had been come to on imperfect knowledge and the chairman of the local bench was present at the meeting of the magistrates, and asked that that decision should not be confirmed. I think if an alteration is desired to be made in the law of such a stringent character as is now proposed, at all events some evidence should be given that the Act has not worked fairly or in the interests of the locality by those who had to work it.

Is it not almost an irony of fate that the Members of the Government who principally attacked the clause of the Bill that gave a discretion of Quarter Sessions over magistrates, should come to this House and propose that a

Commission of strangers to the county should have an absolute power of overriding those on the spot who have a full knowledge of the circumstances of the cases of which these Commissioners cannot possibly know anything? I know that there is a very small modicum of discretion given to the local magistrates, because they are informed that they may select the particular houses which are to be done away with; but I have some little knowledge of local government, and if there is anything I have learned, it is that there is hardly any question which can come forward in which it is not generally desirable that those who know the locality should have the discretion as to the manner as to which they should deal with it and administer the law. If this is true of all sorts of things that come before county councils, surely it is true in a much greater degree with regard to the question of licensing, where the manner in which the public-houses should be dealt with must depend on the local circumstances, on the population, on the position of the houses, on the class of house, and on the areas which they have to serve. I venture to say that no man without knowledge of the local circumstances could possibly come to a satisfactory conclusion in such cases.

Nothing that has caused more dissatisfaction among those who have the management of local government than this new idea that their powers should be overridden by a Commission appointed by the Government. We had some experience of that with regard to the Small Holdings Act. I admit that we have not heard so much about that Commission since the county councils have got to work, because county councils are doing the best they can to administer the Act in a reasonable and fair manner, and therefore the Commissioners have not been called in; but in this case the Commissioners are actually to administer this law, and I venture to think that the Government should trust the localities. If their motto is "Trust the people" it is, at all events, an extraordinary course to pursue to give some discretion to the people to do away with more licences than are required under the Schedule, but not to trust them to carry out the Schedule, and to do away with a sufficient number of licences.

Lord Belper.

I would like to pass to another point, and that is the question of the time-limit. Let me say for myself that I have not the slightest objection in the world. I think it very desirable that the State should, if possible, get control so that they can deal with licences in the way they like in the future. But the whole test of what you ought to do in this matter is, how is it to be done with perfect justice to those whose monopoly value you are going to resume? Let me say, however, that a time-limit is absolutely incompatible with a system of compulsory insurance and compensation, for the reason that the object of a time-limit is to give the licensee security for a specified period, long or short, in which he may be able to recoup himself for the money that he has invested in his business. If all the time he has to be paying very considerable compensation. how can he possibly recoup himself during that time, with the prospect that the moment the time-limit comes to an end his licence may be taken away altogether without any compensation at all? And as was pointed out by a previous speaker, he is now to be shot at from two barrels, because, if the magistrates do not take away his licence, then the enthusiasm of the ratepayers, exercising for the first time their powers under local option, may do away with it. I venture to think that for these reasons it has to be proved that you can fairly attach a time-limit to a system of compensation. It also seems to me to lie with the Government to prove that, a certain amount of compensation being given and a certain number of licences being done away with under the Act of 1904, to do away with the same amount of money with a much larger number of houses is also fair and reasonable to the licensees whose property is going to be taken away.

I venture to say we have had no answer to the arguments which have been used with regard to these matters in the first part of the Bill. No one could listen to the speech of Lord St. Aldwyn without feeling that the questions and arguments he used ought to receive full answer, and until that answer is given, and until the Government show, as they have not shown at present, that they appreciate what we believe to be a grave injustice of the Bill, and give an assurance that they are going to give consideration to the arguments that are used, I certainly cannot vote for the Second Reading. Then with regard to clubs we have learned in the last few years how important that matter has become, because the more licences that are done away with the more clubs are opened in their places. In my own county we have had representations from the police authorities stating in the strongest terms that they could not be answerable for keeping a hold over drunkenness so long as there was no provision for these clubs in regard to which they are perfectly helpless. In accordance with that the licensing committee over which I preside passed a unanimous resolution asking the Government to pass more stringent regulations in regard to clubs. If we could have gone into Committee I should have liked to have seen that part of the Bill made much more stringent and effective than it is, because I believe if those provisions were amended and improved they would have more to do with putting down drunkenness than the former part of the Bill.

I certainly imagined when I took up the Bill that Clause 22 was not necessary, because powers were already given to magistrates, but it appears a legal decision was given which makes it very desirable that that clause should be inserted; but if we had any power of discussing it in Committee, I should have liked to move some Amendments to it, which I think would make it much more effective. I should like to see the magistrates given power in granting a licence to compel any public-house they liked to select to provide reasonable refreshments of a non-alcoholic character. I think one of the great causes of drunkenness at the present moment is that if a man wants some refreshment and is tired, having had a hard day's work, he has nowhere to go except into a drinking-shop, and that if he goes into an ordinary public-house he cannot get ordinary temperance drinks, or ordinary refreshments. I think a very great improvement would be made in the condition of those houses, and that it would be in entire conformity with the growing wish of the people of this country, if some legislation were passed which would insure that there should be in every district a considerable number of houses for the recreation and refreshment of the people where non-alcoholic liquors were provided.

If any of the clauses in the latter part of the Bill were embodied in a separate Bill I should be inclined, in common, I think, with many members on this side of the House, to give them most cordial consideration, because although not what I might call the heroic clauses of the Bill, I think they would really do more to promote the welfare of the people and improve the general conditions under which the liquor laws are now carried on than any other part of the measure. I cannot help expressing my regret that these matters are not able to be discussed in Committee. I feel deeply the objections to the first part of the Bill, but I hope that on some future occasion at all events, this House may be able to voice what I believe is the general feeling of moderate men of all parties who desire to promote legislation for the purpose of improving our public-houses without doing any injustice to those who hold the licences.

LORD FABER: My Lords, there is one very important matter connected with this Licensing Bill that has hardly been touched upon in the debates in this House so far. It is a very important matter, both on account of the money that is represented by it, going into many millions sterling, and also because of the class of investor who is interested in it: I refer to the debenture stock-holders and the preference stock-holders of the big brewery companies. Perhaps I am particularly interested in this subject because I had the advantage of heading a deputation last spring, which waited upon Mr. Asquith, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and put before him the claims of upwards of £100,000,000 sterling debenture holders. We tried to show to Mr. Asquith, and I hope with some success, that the debenture-holder was an honest investor of a good class who had invested in brewery debentures, because he thought that he was getting a safe investment, and he had nothing at the back of his mind with regard to the ordinary profits said to be earned by brewers; he was quite satisfied with the 4 per cent. that the ordinary shareholders promised to pay him in consideration for his debentures. Mr. Asquith listened with great courtesy and attention, and at the end of our interview assured us that there was nothing like confiscation in his mind. We were very well satisfied with that, and I must say it astonished me somewhat when this Licensing Bill was introduced to find as regards debenture-holders and preference shareholders that, if there was not confiscation, there was a great measure of hardship, and I should like, if your Lordships would kindly permit me for a few minutes, to explain to you what I conceive to be the position of the debenture-holder in these great companies.

Let me give you the case of a brewery company, a very common case, I know many like it, whose capital is divided in this way; £400,000 in 4 per cent. debenture stock, £100,000 in 5 per cent. preference stock, and £100,000 of ordinary stock. The debenture stock is covered in the first instance by £400,000 worth of public-houses. I conceive that under this new Act the company will go on for twenty-one years, at any rate, and will continue to pay to the debenture-holder the 4 per cent. to which he is entitled, otherwise, of course, the debenture-holder forecloses and takes the public-houses at once. Therefore they go on for twenty-one years. At the end of the twenty-one years I suppose again that, owing to the fact that the Government will resume possession of the public-houses, the brewery companies will cease to exist. What then is the position of the debenture-holder? He starts, I may remind you, with having put £400,000 cash into these debentures, for which he receives security in the shape of £400,000 worth of public-houses. During the twenty-one years, according to the most expert evidence, he has had drawn for payment under the compensation clauses one-fifth of his debentures. We will say that for that one-fifth of the £400,000 security he gets £80,000 in cash—that is considerably more than he would get, I apprehend, but I want to understate the case rather than to overstate it. Therefore, at the end of the time the £400,000 debenture-holder will be represented by £80,000 in cash and £320,000 in houses. You will notice that he no longer has £320,000 of public-houses but he has £320,000 of houses, which is a very different thing indeed. Now what is the value of this £320,000 of houses which were not originally bought as dwelling houses, but which were bought as public-houses? Fortunately we have statistics which tell us the approximate value of the £320,000 of houses. Messrs. Orgill, who are well known valuers in London, have valued 126 houses for the local authorities for compensation purposes, under sworn testimony. Those 126 houses with their licences were valued at £280,870. Without licences they were valued at only £59,071. Therefore the loss on those houses was £221,799 or 79 per cent. or four-fifths. Therefore we are reduced to this position, that with regard to the debenture-holders, their £320,000 of houses is only a fifth of the £320,000, that is £66,000. Therefore they are left with £80,000 of cash that they get under the compensation, and with £66,000 that they receive for their houses without licences. That is at the end of twenty-one years under the most favourable circumstances the debenture holders will get £144,000 for their £400,000. Of course, against them I have not taken into consideration the possibility of their being done away with altogether without any compensation at all under local option during the last seven years. In their favour, on the other hand, this may be taken, that there should be some margin of loose assets over which the debenture holders would have some claim. But I apprehend, as we are all of us only human, that the ordinary shareholder will have taken care to annex those loose assets before the end of the twenty-one years. That being so the debenture-holder is in the position of only getting £144,000 under the most favourable circumstances instead of the £400,000 that he put in.

Now I come to the preference shareholder. He is in a much worse position, poor man, than the debenture-holder. He starts with 5 per cent. interest, which he gets I suppose for the twenty-one years. At the end of the twenty-one years where is he? He is left without any security whatever, there are no assets, they are all absorbed by the debenture-holder, and, therefore, the preference holder is absolutely confiscated altogether; he gets nothing for his £100,000. I have looked into it as closely as I can, and have tried to state it as fairly as I can, and if this is not confiscation as regards the preference shareholder it is a case of very great hardship indeed, and I confess I cannot see any escape from it. As regards the ordinary shareholder, he has this great pull, that if trade is good during the twenty-one years he can make a very good profit, and out of that profit of course he can secure for himself a certain amount of money which will protect him from any loss he may suffer at the end of the time. That is if the brewery does well, but if it does not do well, he is as badly off as the preference shareholder and the debenture-holder. But if a debenture-holder is a man who earns only a fixed rate of interest for twenty-one years, 4 per cent., I do not see how there is any margin to set aside a reserve fund to preserve him from loss at the end of the time.

I do not know whether it is true, but I should like to mention that if the debenture is in danger then the debenture-holder has a right of entry into the public-houses there and then, but then we have first of all to decide whether the debenture is in danger, and that is a question for the Law Courts, which might take a great deal of law to decide. If, however, he does enter into the public-house how is the debenture-holder capable of managing that public-house? Another important question to my mind is this: a debenture-holder by his deed is only entitled to 4 per cent. interest. If he entered into and got possession of the public-house and that public-house paid 8 or 9 per cent., would he be able to take what he got above the 4 per cent., and put that aside for the twenty-one years? I cannot answer that question. I think it is a very doubtful one. If the debenture-holder pursued that course, would he not be bringing a civil war, so to speak, into the brewery itself, as between the debenture-holder and the ordinary shareholder, and that in any event would mean ruin for the brewery. Therefore, I think, with regard to the ordinary shareholder as against the debenture-holder and the preference shareholder, he is in a very parlous condition indeed. I suppose the investing public invested in these debentures in the first case relying on the well-known legal maxim, which we have heard quoted in this House already although not exactly in these words, that if a public house was conducted according to the law of this country, and properly conducted, there was a human expectation that that licence would be renewed perpetually. On the opposite benches it has been said that the debenture-holder deserves all he gets because he was a foolish investor. Are we not all foolish investors at times? Are we quite sure that we investors who have invested in Government securities during the last three years have been entirely wise? I daresay a debenture-holder would be unwise if he gave £110 for a 4 per cent. debenture for which he ought only to have given £70, but because he gave £110 for what is only worth £70 is that any reason at all why you should confiscate the £70, because that is what you are going to do, at any rate, with regard to the preference shareholder, and most likely with regard to the debenture-holder.

I cannot think that the House intend that any such measure as that should be passed. The teetotallers contend that if this measure be passed, and a reduction of houses brought about thereby, it would add to the bone and sinew, the morale, and the general well-being of the country. If that is so, is that not a further argument in favour of the nation paying a fair price for these public-houses? The nation evidently agree to that argument, and if they are going to receive good value for their money, should they not then be in a position to pay fair value, if not full value, for these public-houses to enable the owners of them to put themselves right with the public whose property they are more or less taking away? Such a change as is proposed will do injury to thousands of His Majesty's subjects. Apparently a kind of moral atmosphere has grown up around this Licensing Bill which people seem to think justifies confiscation. I do not think they intended in the first instance to be so unwise as regards their confiscatory measures, but, at any rate, confiscation has been in the air with regard to it; this idea of confiscation has done a great deal of harm to all our securities in this country and has shaken the faith of the investing public, and I think there is very little doubt that that is the reason why, at this moment, the share market is so depressed.

It has been said that this is eminently a temperance measure. I do not deny that it does make for temperance, but as long as clubs are left in the nearly untouched state in which they are under this Bill, I do not think that it can make very greatly for temperance. For instance, in a big town in the North that I know very well—Leeds—you see every day, now that public-houses are well-conducted and shut up at eleven o'clock at night, the people who have been in them streaming out and going across to their club, where they can drink all night and every night, and all day and every day and all Sunday. Under this Bill the only provision with regard to clubs is that they should be registered and occasionally visited by a policeman in plain clothes. Of course that is nothing like the supervision which is given to the public-houses which are being done away with. The public-house is under the eye of the policeman, who stands close to the door most of the day; the public-house is open to the public gaze, and everything that goes on inside is known. That is not the case, however, with regard to the club. The club is a place where secret drinking can go on, and it wants more supervision than you have given to it in this Bill. I am not here to say that drink is a good thing; I do not think that it is, and I, for one, am decidedly in favour of temperance, if it can be brought about by an ordinary degree of fairness; but if you strive after temperance you must, as I say, remember the innocent holder of these debentures who is going to be confiscated in order to make the people of this country temperate all at once. I say the way to foster temperance is by education and by example. It is being so fostered. We see that temperance is going ahead by leaps and bounds every day, and I am one of those people who are proud to think that, if we can go on in the course we are pursuing, it will not be so very long before England is sober as well as free. The 1904 Act, under which we are now working, is doing fairly good work; licences to the number of 1,200 to 1,500 a year are being done away with; these licences are being paid for by the trade; and I cannot help thinking that it would be more statesmanlike to give a further trial to that Act. I feel sure that it is doing good work, and it is within the knowledge of all of us that the country has become more temperate, from the higher classes downwards. I do not think coercion will do much good. We must gain, surely, the mastery of ourselves. I remember when one was younger, talking about the mischief of want of self-control, some lines that run very much like this, that illustrate the case very well—

> "There is a little public-house
> That everybody knows,
> It is the little public-house
> Just underneath the nose.
> It is a little public-house
> That anyone can close"

and so on.

I think that shows very well the idea that it is more by mastery of ourselves that we shall attain to temperance than by this oppressive measure. There is a clause in the Bill, which I think is a good one, about Sunday-closing, making the hours for being open in London much shorter, reducing them to four instead of the seven or eight at present allowed. That, in my opinion, is good, but I should like to be assured, if I can be so assured, that that alteration in hours would not lead to any possibility of London becoming a secret drinking town. I allude to that, because we all know a very large and prosperous town in the North which, owing to repressive measures of a very harsh sort with regard to drinking facilities, has grown into a town of secret drinking. It would be a lamentable thing indeed if this London of ours were to be turned into a town of that description. We are at any rate fairly temperate at the present day. I do not think that the country wants this Bill; I do not think at the moment that they want legislation by the extremist in any sense or shape, but I do think that the country wants legislation by moderate men for moderate men. Therefore, my Lords, on these grounds I am against the Second Reading of this Bill.

*LORD WILLOUGHBY DE BROKE: My Lords, I do not want to waste your Lordships' time unduly by flogging the dead horse of the Licensing Bill. I think I should be right in saying that the news of the death of this animal will be received with very great relief in all parts of the country, and I am not all at sure that the owners of him will not also share in that relief to a very great extent. I only rise for a moment or two for the purpose of saying how very glad I am that I have been able to listen to this debate; because although I have listened most attentively and have read very carefully in the newspapers the speeches to which I have not had the opportunity of listening, I have not really, with very great respect to noble Lords opposite, heard a single argument except arguments which would only strengthen my resolve to vote for the rejection of this measure. I do not think that it ought to go down to the country, as so many of our opponents try to make out, that this House is not in favour of temperance and that we have ruthlessly cast aside the opportunity now given to us of saying that we are in favour of the temperance cause. There is nobody on this side of the House or in any other part of it who would not gladly favour a good temperance measure provided that it was not accompanied by injustice. But I have not heard in favour of this Bill any real arguments to prove that it is a temperance measure. All the arguments that we have heard proceeded entirely on the assumption that shutting up public-houses is going to make working men more sober. You cannot advance this argument in any direction unless you take into account the other and much more vicious means of obtaining drink of which working men are sure to avail themselves, and indeed have already done so, supposing public-houses are all shut down. No doubt in considering a question of this sort there is something to be said for the doctrine of diminished opportunity. But I submit with great respect that if there is anything in the doctrine of diminished opportunity that doctrine is already on a fair way to being satisfied by the Act of 1904. But personally, as far as I can ascertain for myself, I am not at all sure that the Act of 1904 is going to be such a tremendous success as a temperance measure. Am I not right in saying that the closing of the public-houses which has been effected by that measure has been followed by a rapid opening of clubs, where, as we have heard in the able speech which was delivered just now, drink can be obtained at all hours of the day and night?

I do not know whether noble Lords opposite have ever seen a paper, which I expect is circulated in several of the London districts at any rate, called *Club Life*, and stated to be "Written by a Club-Man for Club-Men." I was looking at that paper this morning. It is a paper with a great many pages in it, and it contains nothing but advertisements of the various forms of entertainments at different working men's clubs on Sundays and so on. I will not say to which political shade of opinion these clubs belong, but most of them belong to one particular grade of political thought. This paper reveals a state of things which I am quite sure the bishops would not care to see taking place generally: that is that on Sundays at twelve o'clock music-hall artistes come in and give performances, and these performances are continued intermittently all the afternoon and evening, and probably most of the night. There is another thing about club life which has not yet been mentioned in this debate, and that is that working men can, by becoming a member of one club, and by the payment of, I think, 5s., become affiliated to all the other clubs in the country, so that a London working man can go to any of these other clubs if he happens to be in Liverpool, or in Manchester, or anywhere else, and straightway avail himself of all the privileges of membership. So you have on foot in this way what is really tantamount to a vast system of public-houses all over the country; but where the restrictions placed on public-houses are entirely evaded. This discloses to my mind a state of affairs for which that school of thought which has always tried to make the public-house unattractive to working men is largely responsible, and it is a state of things that I should like to see altered very much. I was much struck with the eloquent speech delivered by such a very ardent and sincere reformer as the right rev. Bishop of Birmingham, who described the innocent pleasures of the foreign restaurant. In order to avoid a charge of having no remedy on our own account I venture to think that that must be the eventual direction in which we must look for a solution of this problem, and I do not think that it ought to be difficult for the Government, let us say, to attach as a condition to a licence that the public-house must be something more than the mere institution that it is at the present, and that we must realise that we shall have to give to the working man something corresponding to the excellent and luxurious club life of which we are always able to avail ourselves. That is a possible solution by means of legislation. It has been said over and over again in this debate, and in other places, that men must be made sober not by Act of Parliament, but by the force of example. I thought the noble Earl in introducing this Bill was a little bit hard on those who favour the doctrine of the force of example. He said that those who talked about the force of example were not usually those who conducted the moral agencies of the country. With the greatest respect to the noble Earl, I venture to suggest that there is no greater agency in this or any other country than the force of example.

It is not so many years ago in the history of this country that all the influence and most of the wealth was in the hands of Members of your Lordships' House; probably a Peer was the only person who had sufficient money to get drunk with; the possession, consequently, of a title used to be regarded as a synonym for a perfectly legitimate, praiseworthy, and enviable over-indulgence in the pleasures of the table, and it was considered quite a correct expression if a man was noticed to be in a particular state to accuse him of being "as drunk as a lord." But we have changed all that, and I do not think you can look to a better example of the changed times in which we live than by going into any mess of Yeomanry officers when you will see them all drinking barley-water. That is the sort of enormous change that has been going on amongst the upper classes. The noble Earl who introduced this Bill said a thing which, I must say, made me feel rather uncomfortable. He said that the public good must over-ride private interests. I suppose to a certain extent that is true, but I hope that the Government to which the noble Earl belongs will guard themselves against the ruthless, cruel, and thoughtless application of that doctrine. It has been said by another noble Lord who favoured the Second Reading of the Bill that the vast body of clergy in this country were in favour of the measure. With regard to the public good over-riding private interest, I should very much like to quote to your Lordships what the Bishop of Worcester said the other day in answer to a correspondent. I will stand corrected if needs be, because I do not say that these are the actual words, but it is the substance of what he said. I think they are almost the exact words. "While in favour of a measure of temperance, no morality or philanthropy or religion could possibly thrive if it was based upon spoliation or injustice."

That, my Lords, I think, is a very important opinion, coming from a very high authority. I will not make too great a point of the word "spoliation." It may be an ugly word, but at the same time those of us who had the good fortune to be here have just listened to a very masterly and lucid exposition of the position of the innocent investors in breweries, who have invested their money in brewery shares in perfect good faith. I know quite well from what has happened this afternoon that if I were to mention the widows and the orphans noble Lords opposite would probably laugh, but it is no laughing matter for the investors in breweries, whether they be widows and orphans or not, and I think all these small investors will heave a very great sigh of relief when they know that this Bill

Lord Willoughby de Broke.

is once and for all killed. Their circumstances are such that they will think that they are peculiarly inappropriate to the exercise of that spirit of sacrifice which the noble Earl who introduced the Bill considers so essentially a portion of the measure. There are so many of these people to whom to cross the very narrow margin between poverty and penury would be a very serious matter indeed. A great many of them have only a sufficient income to enable them to buy the very smallest comforts, even only the necessities of life, and to indulge in the very small acts of charity which their previous bringing-up and good breeding would legitimately entitle them to indulge in; and for those people the passing of this Bill would be a very serious matter, invested as their money has been by their trustees in an investment which has been sanctioned, and, indeed, encouraged, by the Legislature. It has been said that it is no use talking any more about the Licensing Bill, because the result is a foregone conclusion. I think with great respect, on the contrary, that the debate—I am not referring to my own contribution to it, but to the contribution of the noble Lords opposite—will have a very good effect indeed on the country, because I think that anybody who carefully studies this debate will not be able to find any cogent or forcible arguments in favour of the passing of this Bill as a temperance measure; and I do not hesitate to say, on behalf of those whom I have had the opportunity of meeting in the country districts, that the action of the House of Lords will be thoroughly applauded by all who value the good faith of the State and the credit and integrity of the country.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD: My Lords, the noble Earl who has just sat down said in the earlier part of his speech that he had heard no argument from this side of the House which in any way convinced him that this Bill was a Bill which ought to be read a second time. I understood him to speak to that effect. If that is so I can hardly hope that I can say anything which would be likely in any way to influence his judgment. If he has not been persuaded by the arguments of the noble Earl who introduced the Bill, or let us say the arguments of the most rev. Prelate who spoke this afternoon, or of the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, I am quite sure that nothing that I could say would have any influence on him. But there is one remark of the noble Lord with which I do most thoroughly agree if I understood it aright, and that is that he said it was alleged that this debate was practically a debate on a foregone conclusion. Many of us feel that, and it is a fact which makes debating very difficult in this House. We feel that our attendance here during these three days of long hours of listening is a work of supererogation, that we are not engaged in an attempt to persuade or convince each other, but that we are engaged in a solemn make-believe, and that the speeches that are being made are in fact little more than funeral orations on this measure. That is, at any rate, the impression which has gone abroad in the country, if I may venture to say so. It is felt that the noble Marquess has come down to the House with his mandate from the meeting in another famous house, and for my part I profoundly regret that that mandate is so directly contradictory to what I hold to be the mandate that really comes from the country and the people. That mandate ought surely to be plain enough to most of us Members of this House. We have the mandate which has come in the various petitions which have been presented to the House, and those who are outside the House hardly know, I venture to think, the enormous amount of public feeling which has been poured into this House on this occasion in the shape of petitions from all sorts of organisations who are working up and down the country in every quarter for the benefit of the people. We had on our Notice Paper yesterday, I think something like ten folio pages taken up with the names of the various beneficent and other societies, Churches, Chapels, congregations, engaged, all of them, in working for the good of the people—something like ten pages covered by the names of these associations sending petitions in favour of this Bill, and on the other side we had only about ten lines enumerating the petitions sent up in favour of the trade. In this morning's Notice Paper, if I counted aright, we had fourteen pages covered with the names of the various societies in the country petitioning for this Bill, and we had, on the other hand, four lines only filled by those petitioning against it. Therefore, we have the mandate, I think I am justified in saying, of the great majority of the people in this country who are working for the good of their fellow countrymen—twenty-four pages covered by names on one side in favour of the Bill, and fourteen lines on the other side. That is the sort of mandate which I really thought would have made some impression on the noble Lords who met in that famous house the other day. Then again, we have the majority of 237 from the representatives of the people of England in another place. That, I take it, should have had some influence with noble Lords in waiting for the discussion in this House rather than in virtually condemning the Bill before they had heard arguments in favour of it. I say nothing of the gigantic evil which everywhere pervades our English life, and must be to some extent familiar to every Member of this House. It has been described here in these debates in eloquent terms, and I will not detain you with any attempt at further description of it, but from every quarter we have received the unanimous declaration that this evil of excessive drinking is the one which meets every reformer first of all, and is the greatest of all obstacles in the way of social reform. Under these circumstances I venture to think it would have been at any rate more respectful if the country had not been flooded with the accounts of that remarkable meeting before we came to discuss the matter in this House.

Turning to the Bill, surely we have had many admissions from the other side of the House that this Bill deserved discussion with something more like an open mind. We have heard a great deal, especially about the financial aspect of the question, but in spite of all the argument we have heard many of us still believe that this Bill on its financial side is not only a just Bill, but a generous one. Some noble Lords seem to think that a statement which is in itself ludicrous, but, my Lords, if a Bill which gives to the licence-holders fourteen years respite with an additional halcyon seven years is not just and generous what are we to say of the decisions which such men as Lord Peel and Archbishop Temple came to after a long and serious and dispassionate investigation of the whole question? As all the world knows, they said that the conclusion to which they came, and Lord Peel entered that investigation with a thoroughly open mind, and if I may venture to say so, with a mind trained beyond that of most of us, was that they considered a seven years notice would be just. What has happened in the meantime to make a fourteen or twenty-one or practically a twenty-two years' time-limit unjust? I do not think that any Member on the Opposition side of this House can explain to us how it is there should be such a difference in the estimates of honourable men on that point. Then again we have here in this Bill, putting aside these clauses with regard to finance, many clauses which all acknowledge to be full of great and beneficent reforms, and reforms not only beneficent but long overdue, overdue because of the infinite mischief that has been done year after year for the want of these reforms, and which mischief will go on working and extending itself during all the years which follow from your rejection of this Bill.

I was glad to hear the noble Viscount St. Aldwyn say last night in effect that he hoped what he call the temperance measures in this Bill, as apart from the financial portion of it, might be reintroduced as a new Bill. I was glad to think that he with his great influence would be ready to facilitate the passing of such a Bill. We thank him for that expression, and I think my noble friends on this side will be ready to take advantage of it. This Bill strikes many of us as deserving of support not only for these reasons but because it gives back to the people freedom to improve the conditions of their own lives, and that I take it is one of the best elements of the

Bill. Then again it is a Bill, as all of us, wherever we may live, must know, that removes manifold temptations out of the way of the weaker and more tempted members of the community. We have had some attempt at brushing aside the value of this diminishing of temptation. I do not know why the authors of the 1904 Act should now stand up and say that the lessening of the number of public-houses and the decreasing accordingly of the number of temptations is not a temperance measure. If they say that, why did they introduce their 1904 Bill and why, when they introduced their Bill, did they say, "This is the greatest temperance measure that has ever been brought into Parliament"? But it is really an amazing statement, when you think of it, that the shutting up of these houses is not to be a benefit to the temperance of the country, is not to save people from the dangers of falling into the sin of drunkenness. Why, indeed, it is a new and amazing and alarming doctrine which is really involved in this argument which we have heard more than once in the course of this debate—this new doctrine that temptation does not lead to fall. It is difficult for anyone who is familiar with all the details of the life of many of the weaker members of society to listen patiently to those arguments. Are there those among us who really hold that the multiplying of temptation does not lead to fall? If so, I ask them with what sort of thought do they use their Lord's Prayer?

I deeply regret the determination with which apparently so many noble Lords have come down to this House to reject the Second Reading of this Bill. But while saying so much I have also to confess that there are parts of the Bill with which I am not very much enamoured. I confess to a certain sense of disappointment in regard to the part that deals with clubs, like the noble Lord who has just sat down and other speakers from the other side. I feel that that portion of the Bill, though good as far as it goes, might be materially strengthened, and I had hoped that if your Lordships had read the Bill a second time, you would have joined hands with us in attempting to strengthen the Bill. That was my hope, but I confess to some surprise that this denunciation of the existing clubs should be used as an argument against the new measure. The new Bill at any rate would make it impossible for any of the existing clubs to go on as they are now going on. It would sweep them away by the conditions of annual registration, inspection, and all the other improvements connected with it. It would sweep away the greater part of the abuses now complained of by noble Lords opposite. But may I be permitted to say that I think the authors of the 1904 Act are the very last persons who ought to have any claim to bring that argument before us. When they introduced their Bill and passed their Act with its marvellously imperfect arrangement for the reduction of houses, why did they not take the matter of clubs into consideration? Why did they leave an open field for any bogus club to be established immediately? Why did they leave it possible for a brewer whose house was shut up for some reason or another to open that house the next day as a drinking club? I imagine that they have no answer to that question, and having no answer I think that they ought to have spared us the denunciation of this Bill because of the futility of their own Act. The noble Marquess made a great deal of that point, and I was surprised that he did so. He even illustrated his argument by the case of a club—I do not know whether it was a Radical Club, but very likely it was—in which, as he said, the accounts showed the sale of a halfpennyworth of bread to an intolerable amount of sack. That was a very interesting quotation, but I wonder it did not occur to him that this was a club that had come into existence under their own Act. Coming from the other side of the House that was not a convincing argument, because some of us felt that there was even an inclination on that side to increase the cost of the bread and to make the sack more abundant.

Besides the club question I confess also to not being very much satisfied with what has been done in regard to the off-licences. If I may venture to hark back for a moment and say one word more about the clubs, my desire and my hope would have been, with regard to the sale of drink, that all clubs, whether they be in Pall Mall or anywhere else, should have been placed as regards the sale of drink on the same footing as the public-houses. That is perhaps an extreme temperance view which would hardly be endorsed even by noble Lords opposite. I pass to off-licences for a moment. I have to confess that although the steps taken are good so far as they go, because the Bill brings those licences under the local authority, still I consider that the arrangements of the Bill are inadequate. I venture to think, as the result of my personal experience, that off-licences should not be given to tradesmen who sell all sorts of things. A grocer ought not to be given a licence which brings him within the sphere of this dangerous trade. That is the principle on which I base my objections to the off-licences. I say the licence should be given to those who are engaged in this particular trade and not in other trades as well. I think few of us can have lived in the country without being conscious of the openings that exist for abuse which the grocer's licence gives. I have in my own mind at this moment the memory of the ruin of a young curate—this is my own experience—simply because he was served by his grocer along with his grocery with various kinds of drink. He had been in the habit of sending for this drink, and the grocer's cart brought to this curate, a poor man with a very small stipend, something like so large an amount as £31 worth of drink in six months. So that he was spending more than even the working man is supposed to spend a week out of his limited income. He ruined his prospects in life, and yet the grocer who held that licence, and supplied that drink, which by the by was never paid for, was a very respectable person holding a responsible position, and I venture to say that instances of that kind, which can be multiplied, are sufficient to show that we ought to put an end to this system. There may be better ways of putting an end to it, but my own humble suggestion would be that a licence should not be given to persons who are also sending out other articles besides drink.

But there is another reason why I am somewhat lukewarm with regard to this Bill, and that is in respect of the time-limit. My reasons are somewhat different, probably, from those of the noble Lords opposite. I look upon the time-limit of fourteen years that this Bill has introduced, as not only a just, but a generous limit, and I have been led to that conclusion both by my own investigations in the matter, which have been considerable, and by the conclusions, as I have said, of such men as Viscount Peel and Archbishop Temple. But I have never seen or heard any reason yet why the Prime Minister should have given another period, a halcyon period of seven years. I read the Prime Minister's statement when he made that concession. I noticed the very fervent and emphatic way and the very attractive rhetoric in which he said that it was not intended to placate the enemy; but I heard no adequate reason why it should have been given, and I hold that it is an extravagant giving away of the money of the people. I imagine that many persons hardly realise how much of the public money is really being given away by this long extension of time-limit. I am prepared to give it, if we could have the settlement, but I feel that we are giving a tremendous price, and that we are not giving our own money, but the money of the taxpayer and the ratepayer.

Allusion has already been made to a very interesting and, I venture to think, authoritative book which has lately been published and is now in its second edition, Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell's book on the taxation of licences. I do not know whether noble Lords have studied it, but it is really a very interesting and illuminating book; and in that book it is declared that if we were to tax our liquor trade up to the average of the United States we should have an additional income from it of £7,300,000 per annum. If we raised our taxation to the level of that of the finest state of America, it would be very much larger than £7,300,000. So that, you see, if we earmark and hand over to the trade for twenty-one years, all this enhanced income, which would only bring us up to the level of the United States, what a tremendous amount of money we are handing over to this trade. I suppose I may presume that practically this Bill is dead, and that we are only really attending here at its obsequies. But my hope is that this is by no means the end of the matter; it is really the beginning of a new period of temperance legislation perhaps on new lines, and possibly more effective ones. And my hope, to begin with, is this, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer may have the courage to give us something like a proper return from this trade in the shape of high licences. I think it is time that the people began to come to their own, and on that account I feel it is a consolation that we have not to wait for twenty-one years before we come to our own.

Then, again, I have the hope that we may see established a new system of inspection of public-houses. I have for a considerable time, as the result of my experience in one city and another and in one country town and another, come to the conclusion that if we are to have the existing laws properly administered we ought to have a system of what I may call State inspectors, and that we should no longer be content to leave the oversight of these houses and this trade entirely to this or that locality, because of all the manifold influences in every locality which tend to interfere with the proper administration of the law in this respect. I have here what I may venture to say, on behalf of a new system of State or Imperial inspectors, the testimony of a very experienced justice of the peace. This gentleman has been a justice of the peace and a sheriff in Lancashire, and he has also been a justice of the peace in a southern county. He is a man of long experience, and he holds that Licensing Bills would hardly be required if we had a proper system of national inspectors, altogether independent of local influences, watch committees, and so forth. No one can read the evidence before Lord Peel's Commission without having seen what corruption, indirect or direct, you may find, in this matter, under the various watch committees. This experienced justice of the peace declares in the strongest terms that a great many of the most dangerous public-houses in the country could be shut up if we had a proper system of inspection, and this gentleman whom I am venturing to quote is a very staunch and sound Conservative.

May I venture another remark on behalf of this system of inspection which I advocate? It is based on what the Bishop of London told us last night. He reminded us of what was said with regard to one of his missions in Westminster on a certain midnight march. I forget the exact number of people under the influence of drink, or drunk, whom he and his companions met in that march, but the curious thing was that there was not a single publican in that district who had seen a drunken man, and there was not a single policeman in that district who had arrested one. Why, what a curious state of things we have! Here are a number of very disinterested persons who believe that they see a great number of drunken people, and here are the people who supply the drink, who are certain that not a single drunken person was in their houses; and here are the police, who also see none of them. It seems almost as difficult to arrive at a definition of drunkenness as it is to arrive at a definition of monopoly value. But I venture to think that if we had a system of inspectors independent of local organisations we should find it much easier to agree as to when the law was broken and when it was not. So much for my hopes with regard to the future. I hope to see the high licences; I hope to see a better system of inspection; and largely a national one, and a new Bill, with all the best clauses of this Bill, again before this House, and I feel sanguine that we may see that placed upon the Statute-book.

If I may venture to intrude a little longer, I would like to add that there is a good deal of misunderstanding about the really equitable claims for compensation in regard to this matter. For my own part, I hold that we cannot arrive at a real and right understanding of the matter without looking for a moment into the history of the tied-house system. This tied-house system does not represent the traditional system, and it has none of the claims of an old established system. It is in fact a mushroom growth, and a growth under very peculiar circumstances, and it is on account of these circumstances that I hold these new companies have very little claim either in justice or in equity. Really the root of our trouble in this matter has been because of the system of tied houses to brewery companies. These companies have almost all come into existence since 1883. The late Lord Chancellor gave us an illustration of three companies. But for fear of interrupting him I should have liked to interpose, and ask when those companies came into existence. I am sorry he is not here, but I may say that most of these companies came into operation after the year 1883 and after the legal advisers of the trade gave decisions one after another reminding the trade that the interest created by a licence was not anything like a freehold, but was precarious, and was likely to disappear, or diminish in value and volume. At this moment, that is after 1883, the financier steps in, and he begins to float company after company. I am old enough to remember all these years, the phenomena before us were these: private breweries became limited liability companies, and owners gathered in outside investors, in these companies, many of whom, of course, were the trustees for the widows and orphans, so that these brewery companies became a sort of refuge for outside investors. But there are some curious facts connected with this flotation of companies, as noble Lords know very well. In that interesting book by Rowntree and Sherwell, to which the noble Marquess referred, I found the other day a mention of three companies which were amalgamated; that statement has been before the public a long time, and has never been contradicted, so far as I know. Those three breweries before amalgamation and the issue of a prospectus under new conditions owned a capital of a little more than £3,000,000, but in the course of a very few months those companies had been amalgamated and floated afresh, and by some mysterious process that capital had grown to £8,000,000. There was an increment of £5,000,000 on the capital of those companies. I suppose a good deal of that £5,000,000 was taken up in debentures and by shares by trustees, and widows and orphans. That case may be a somewhat exceptional one, but there you have an instance which certainly shows what a hollow business this financial flotation was as regards, I will not say more, the interests of the innocent outside investing public. This capital grew in the night like Jonah's gourd, and was it surprising that it withered in the night also? You have been reminded by the Bishop of London that many of these companies were practically ruined by this over-capitalisation before this Bill was thought of and I do not think it is quite fair on us who are advocating temperance measures that we should be held responsible, or that we should be asked to compensate those who have indulged in this kind of gigantic speculation.

Then, again, on the formation of these companies there followed a competitive boom of buying up public-houses all over the country at exorbitant prices. I have cases close to my own lodge gates by which I can illustrate that. Then comes the question of low rents in connection with these tied-houses, artificial rents, and altogether inadequate valuations, and what has been the effect on the local ratepayers? Surely the effect is that the local ratepayers have had to pay an undue share if these houses are not paying their proper share. These are among the objections which I feel to the tied-house system, and they are arguments, I take it, against the very large claims which the owners of property under that system are making upon us. But I have still a greater objection than all. This tied-house system is part of what is called exclusive dealing. I have been surprised again and again that this system of exclusive dealing, in connection with licences given by the public for the public interest, should have been allowed to go on as it has, because the granting of a licence under the conditions of exclusive dealing is detrimental to the public interest; it is not in the interest of the public that the man licensed should be bound, for instance, to sell possibly the worst beer of the neighbourhood, and possibly the worst articles of the neighbourhood. It is altogether against the public interest, and it is entirely against the interests of the publican, and still more it is contrary, if

I understand the matter aright, to the principles of the Truck Acts which led your fathers to pass those beneficent Acts a generation ago. On these grounds I am entirely opposed to the tied-house system, or to any compensation beyond what is just and reasonable and generous. I have a still greater objection and that is the moral objection. I do not think that many of the investors in these tied houses really know the nature of the trade out of which they make their profits; they would not, I believe, continue to take them if they realised that it is a trade which they would be ashamed to conduct in their own person.

In conclusion, I desire with all respect to say that I think that in the somewhat—I hardly like to use the word cynical—but in the manner in which this Bill has been practically destroyed, before it has been discussed in this House, your Lordships could hardly have considered the full effect of what you have done, and I am quite sure from my knowledge of the country that there will be a very general feeling that your Lordships have not considered the best interests of the country in this matter, that you have in fact subordinated the legislative freedom of the people, the modern and social well-being of the masses, and the progressive improvement of those masses, in some degree to the claims of party policy, and in some degree to the interests of a particular trade, and I am convinced that the people are not likely to forget this. As a matter of fact, if this Bill is rejected in this way, and nothing else is done, it amounts to slamming the door in the face of all social reform. Yes, we sometimes enter into these matters with a light heart, as conflicts have often been entered into with light hearts before—conflicts which have led to ultimate disaster, and I venture to say this much, that if your Lordships make it a challenge to the people I think the people will accept the challenge. For myself I am an old man, but still I hope to live to see a good many advances in popular freedom, and I rather wonder that you do not take a warning from the lessons of history. I am assuming that the people in the mass, the intelligent part of the people—and we have their representatives in another place unanimously in favour of this Bill—will say that you have not treated this Bill with the respect which it deserves, and I venture to ask, if you come into conflict with the people on these great and fundamental social matters, was it ever seen in the conflict between a free people and the privileged classes that those classes won anything in the end but discredit and ultimate disaster; and I am afraid that we are, perhaps, precipitating that end. My last word is this. I think your Lordships have to some extent overlooked and disregarded or forgotten or underrated what is a very important and growing factor in public life, and that is the uprising of an educated and free democracy, a democracy that has begun to feel its own strength, and to see with a clearer vision and to be more firm about its claims, I venture to think that this democracy will not be very long content to have its claims for social reform contemptuously thrown aside, and unless I am greatly mistaken, I fear that an action of this kind taken upon such a great measure may be tantamount to digging the grave of some of your Lordships' inherited privileges.

*THE LORD STEWARD (Earl BEAUCHAMP): My Lords, the exigencies of the course of the debate in the last few days have made it difficult for a Member of His Majesty's Government to reply earlier to the speeches which have been made from the front Opposition bench. I hope, however, that the noble Marquess whose Motion is on the Paper did not think it discourteous on the part of His Majesty's Government for them not to have been represented earlier in the debate. The reason was that we were anxious that those Members of your Lordships' House who had not had an opportunity of addressing it, should, on such an important occasion as this, have every opportunity of making their views known to your Lordships.

However, it now falls to my lot, as the first speaker from this bench after the noble Marquess had moved the Motion which is now before your Lordships, to deal or to attempt to deal with some of the arguments which he specially addressed to His Majesty's Government. In attempting so to do, I am glad to think that I am fortified by some of the arguments which were used by the noble Marquess himself on a previous occasion. He told us yesterday that his objections to this Bill were directed, not to points of detail, but to fundamental principles in this Bill, and he explained to your Lordships that it was mainly a Bill for the reduction of licences. In 1904, in winding up the debate on the Licensing Act of that year the noble Marquess used these words—

> "Although the Bill may not be as imposing a measure as some noble Lords opposite desire, it is, nevertheless, a substantial step towards a diminution in the number of licences which all who have given consideration to the question, from the Royal Commission presided over by the noble Viscount downwards, have regarded as an indispensable preliminary to any progress in temperance reform."

And there is another quotation from the speech of the noble Marquess on the same occasion to the effect—

> "I gather from the speeches delivered that we all believe that a reduction in the number of licences is a step in the direction of temperance."

Therefore, so far as this Bill deals with the question of the reduction of licences, I am glad to think that, in spite of yesterday's criticisms, the noble Marquess is persuaded that a considerable reduction is really and truly necessary.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: If the noble Lord had paid attention to what I said yesterday he would have seen that I admitted that reduction of licences carried on in a discriminating fashion was undoubtedly a step in the direction of temperance reform. My complaint is that this Bill is wholly different from our Bill of 1904.

*EARL BEAUCHAMP: If the noble Marquess will allow me, I will deal with that point by reading another quotation of his on the same point. It was not only the Marquess himself who spoke in favour of the reduction of licences, but the Leader of the Opposition in another place, who was then the head of His Majesty's Government, spoke to the same effect, and I think Viscount Cross spoke even more strongly in that direction. If the complaint of the noble Marquess is that this Bill dealt mainly with the question of the reduction of licences, and neglected altogether a great part of the field of temperance reform, I do not think that he quite does justice to the full scope of this Bill. A large number of the speeches delivered in the course of this debate have dealt with the other topics contained in the Bill—monopoly value, time-limit, and the very large number of matters which are dealt with in other clauses. Let me remind the noble Marquess that of this Bill of forty-nine clauses there are twenty in Part III., which deal with miscellaneous Amendments, six in Part IV., and an equal number in Part V. Those six clauses in Part IV. deal entirely with clubs, with regard to which I think the noble Marquess complained that the Bill had not sufficiently dealt.

One of the main points with which I think the noble Marquess dealt yesterday was that it was not yet proved that excessive drinking facilities were really conducive to drunkenness. I am glad to think that I am able to bring to the notice of the noble Marquess a very striking case which really deals with this question. There is an area in Birmingham which is known as the Floodgate Street area, a district which has attracted a great deal of attention from all those who are interested in social reform throughout the country as well as those who live near Birmingham itself. In that district, the Floodgate Street area, in Birmingham, there is an immense proportion of public-houses. The justices unanimously decided in 1904 that there were too many licences in that area. There were no less than forty-five for a population of 7,000 persons, that is, one public-house for every eighty-nine persons over the age of eighteen years. I have here some statistics with regard to the general death and birth rates which show the condition of that area and to which I specially wish to draw the attention of your Lordship's House, not because this is a particularly exceptional case, but because I think it is fairly typical of the condition in a great many, too many, of the slums in the large cities. The general death rate in that area was 31·51 per 1,000, as against nineteen in the city; infant mortality was 252 per 1,000, as against 151 in the city. In the healthiest area the general death rate was only twenty-one whereas in the worst it was no less than sixty-three, and in the year 1902 one out of every three deaths took place in some public institution. But that is not all. A large number of hospital cases coming entirely from the Floodgate Street area have been dealt with in the Birmingham General Hospital. In one year no less than 625 were dealt with in that way; and there is constant complaint from those who are interested in the school children in that area of the condition in which they come to school. In this area, as I have said, there is a very large number of public-houses. So much stirred was public opinion in Birmingham on this question that they insisted on a reduction of the licensed premises and of the facilities for drinking within that district, and I have before me the report of the medical officer of health, in which he says that the drink question is one of the greatest importance and one of real danger to the public health. What has been the result of such reduction? What has been the effect of this too small reduction which has taken place in that area? It is the unanimous testimony of every social worker concerned in that area that the evil complained of has considerably toned down since that time, that the number of violent cases are much fewer, and that there has been a very considerable improvement all round in that district. There are still in that area twenty-eight licensed houses to a population of 7,000, and I hope it will be possible to reduce that number still further, and I do not doubt that the effect of further reducing those facilities will lead to a further reduction in the number of cases of brutality and drunkenness.

Now let me turn to some other points which have been mentioned by the noble Marquess. He said that this Bill did not touch the consumer. It is quite true that our measure does not touch the consumer directly, but I would like to ask the noble Marquess if his own Act of 1904 touched the consumer. A large number of those people who have been convicted of drunkenness in the past ought to be considered as being victims, to a large extent, of the circumstances under which they live, and it is the express wish of the Government to remove those temptations from the people and give them fewer opportunities for drunkenness. The noble Marquess stated that this Bill did not tend to humanise the conditions of the public-house trade. In reply to this point again I rely on his own Act of 1904 in which that matter was left out altogether.

Another criticism which has been made is in regard to our treatment of clubs. In this respect I think there is a very important correction to be made in regard to the statement which has been made by more than one noble Lord in the course of this debate. Before I touch that statement let me put this point to the noble Marquess. He said it was useless to deal with excessive drinking in public-houses unless we treat clubs in a similar manner. This indicates that there are two alternatives. Either the whole matter should be left alone, or else the noble Marquess is anxious that we should deal with clubs far more stringently than we propose to do in the Bill now before the House. I venture to ask the noble Marquess what is the policy of himself and his friends upon this point. Are they really anxious that we should put further restrictions upon clubs, and if so, will they indicate in the course of the debate what other restrictions they think should be imposed upon clubs. It is a remarkable fact that more than one of the noble Marquess's friends in another place were very anxious that some of the restrictions imposed by the present Bill upon clubs should be removed because they thought some of them went a great deal too far. We shall watch with interest the line which will be taken by the noble Marquess when the Bill dealing with this question is brought in from an independent quarter of your Lordships' House. We shall then see whether the noble Marquess in the consideration of that Bill, will propose Amendments strengthening the clauses which relate to clubs. The statement I am anxious to correct is to be found in a quotation made by Lord Midleton on 25th June, in which it was stated that wherever a public-house was closed a club was there established to swoop down on the profits and continue the abuses, thus keeping alive for the temperance party a valuable subject matter for agitation. The noble Marquess yesterday used language almost as strong. He told us that if there was one thing which had been clearly established it was that where public houses were reduced the number of clubs increased.

Let me turn for a moment to inquire how far that proposition is borne out by the available statistics. I turn to the licensing statistics for 1907 and compare them with those published for 1905. I shall trouble your Lordships with the actual statistics, first with regard to county boroughs, and then I will give the figures relating to municipal boroughs. The net increase in the county boroughs of England in the two years from 1905 to 1907 in clubs is thirty-three, but the decrease in public-houses is no less than 946. That shows a striking discrepancy in view of the statement that for every public-house which is shut a new club opens. In the municipal boroughs of this country during the same period there was a decrease of 216 in the number of public-houses and a net increase of only thirty-five in the total number of clubs. Therefore, I think it is rather important if that statement is going to be repeated in your Lordships' House that it should be substantiated by figures and not merely by vague assertions. It has been complained that this Bill does not deal sufficiently with clubs. I venture to draw the attention of your Lordships especially to one clause which was the subject of considerable discussion, which relate to tied clubs. That really is a very valuable clause and one which deserves a little praise at any rate from the noble Marquess. Another complaint made is that our Bill does not deal sufficiently with off-licences. It is not enough in this matter to rely merely upon the fact that the Act of 1904 did not deal with this question. I wish to point out that in regard to this matter of the off-licences there was a Parliamentary bargain made in 1902, and therefore there is very good reason for not disturbing it at the present time. But apart from this bargain there is a provision dealing with off-licences, because the monopoly value for a new licence is taken under this Bill, and at the end of the period the monopoly value of all those off-licences is also taken.

Let me turn to another point upon which we have heard a great deal to-night as well as last night, namely, the question of the compensation which is to be given for these public-houses. The noble Marquess gave us last night what I venture to think was a rather curious figure. He stated that 95 per cent. of the money available for compensation had actually been spent. I think we can go further and tell your Lordships the actual number of public-houses which have been closed in order to show how very little has been done in comparison with what was promised at the time of the passing of the Act of 1904. This is the quotation from the noble Marquess which was referred to earlier in the evening also by the noble Lord who is not now in the House, Lord Belper. The noble Marquess, speaking on the Second Reading of the Licensing Bill in 1904, said it would get rid annually of something between 1,500 and 2,000 licences. What are the facts? What has resulted in regard to this pessimistic prophecy of the noble Marquess? The Act of 1904 has been in full operation for three years. Under its compensation clauses 2,805 houses have been actually closed; the licences of 515 others have been refused and will be paid for out of the fund provided for the year 1907. That makes a total of 3,320 or only 1,107 for each year. There is this still more remarkable fact about it, that both the references and the refusals were fewer in 1907 than in 1906. It is pretty evident that, bad or inadequate as was the operation of this Act during the first years after it was passed, the rate of the compensation and reduction is decreasing year by year, and I think we may fairly say in view of those facts that the Act of 1904 has not fulfilled the expectations held out to us by the then Government, and therefore there is urgent need for a revision of the whole matter. The noble Marquess intimated that he was satisfied with the rate of reduction as it was going on at the present time.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I said just the contrary. I stated that I should welcome a measure for accelerating the rate of reduction.

*EARL BEAUCHAMP: I understood the noble Marquess was satisfied with the rate of reduction, but I am very glad to hear that that portion of His Majesty's Bill does not meet with his entire disapprobation. I only wish we could carry him a little further and obtain his approval of the method which the Government has adopted to accomplish this object. How badly the Act of 1904 has worked is not very difficult to prove. The Birmingham justices have passed a resolution in which they call attention to the inadequacy of the compensation clauses of the Licensing Act of 1904, and they urge upon the Government to promote such Amendments to the licensing laws as will render an increased rate of reduction possible. I should like to give your Lordships one example of the way in which the compensation clauses of the Act of 1904 have worked. I will give the case of a Leeds public-house which was closed last December. It was assessed for rates at £65 per annum. After the licence had been taken away it was assessed only at £50 per annum. That is to say, after subtracting the one from the other the annual value of the licence appears to be only £15. If you capitalise that sum at twenty years purchase you get a capital value of £300. What, my Lords, was the compensation which was claimed for this house? It was no less a sum than £10,223, although the annual value of the licence appeared to be no more than £15. The compensation which was actually received was no less a sum than £6,300. That shows, I think, very clearly indeed that there is a very urgent need for some reform. I think the noble Marquess himself went so far as to agree that there was need for reform with regard to the incidence of taxation upon public-houses. There is clearly something wrong in this matter. If the compensation in this case was not excessive, then I think it is clear that the house should have been assessed for rates at a very much larger sum than £65 a year before the licence was taken away. I am afraid this point is closely bound up with the question of the innocent investor and the widows and orphans of whom we have heard so much to-night. But there are more widows and orphans to be considered than those who have placed their investments in brewery companies. There are the women and children whose husbands and fathers have been ruined by drink, and I do not hesitate to say that for every woman and child who may have been placed in the unfortunate position alluded to through a reduction in the value of brewery shares there are nearly 100 who suffer because their relations have taken to drink. Whether you find them in the public-house or in the workhouse there is a very large number of those unfortunate men whose unhappy position is the direct result of habits of intemperance, which has brought ruin and misery upon their families. There are other women and children who may have lost money in connection with brewery investments. There are those women and children who were induced to put their money into breweries which were overcapitalised. Many brewery companies have been floated for a sum of money far exceeding their real capital value, and now those companies have reached a more stable level, and have really come down to what we may call the proper investment paying level. The result, however, of all this has been that the women and children whose money was invested in those companies have had to suffer loss. But that, my Lords, is no fault of the Government and it has no relation whatever to the Licensing Bill. All those transactions took place before the present Government took office, and it is impossible to saddle His Majesty's Government with any responsibility for that.

I will now ask your Lordships to turn to the First Schedule of the Bill, because on more than one occasion it has been said that the scheduled proportion of licences to population is based upon a cast-iron scale. It is the second modification to which I should like to call attention. This matter was specially mentioned, amongst others, by the noble Marquess. He said that in country areas, it would be a hardship upon the agricultural labourer There is, however, a provision that a modification may be made in a rural area where the strict application of the scale appears to be expedient, and that seems to meet this case. I venture to hope that this "uninstructed multitude" to which the noble and learned Earl, Lord Halsbury, referred will not learn what this Bill proposes from the speeches made by noble Lords opposite. Let me go a little further. This anxiety on behalf of the agricultural labourer is somewhat new on the part of noble Lords opposite. [Cries of "No, no."] When the Small Holdings and Allotments Act was before the House I do not remember any noble Lords who were anxious that the small holdings and allotments should be provided close to the cottages of the agricultural labourers. It is only on behalf of the mug of beer that there is this anxiety to provide for the comfort of the agricultural labourer. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] There is a very fair analogy which may be drawn with regard to the compensation which is offered by His Majesty's Government. There is also another analogy which might also have been taken in regard to agriculture. There are a large number of farm leases which are merely held on an annual tenancy with an expectation of renewal. When these leases are withdrawn no compensation whatever is offered. It is, however, different in regard to this Licensing Bill, under which considerable compensation is offered to the tenant. There are a large number of Committee details with which, at this late hour of the night, I shall not venture to trouble your Lordships, because I think it is really of very little use considering Committee points upon the Second Reading, and more especially upon the present occasion.

The noble Viscount, Lord St. Aldwyn, seemed to me to base most of his opposition to this Bill upon Committee details. Like the noble Lord who spoke from the cross benches this evening—I wondered for some time upon which side in the end he intended to give his vote. But at the conclusion of his speech, the noble Viscount said it was because no compromise had been offered by His Majesty's Government that he had finally determined to vote against the Second Reading. If the noble Viscount had been present, I would have asked him at what moment he expected an offer of compromise to be made. Hardly had the Third Reading of this Bill been passed in another place, when your Lordships met in a famous house in a famous square. Are we to understand that that meeting was not the hostile one which some of us imagined it to be? Was it really an Ark from which a new olive branch was sent forth from noble Lords opposite? If so, I have never seen a more bellicose olive branch than the Motion which the noble Marquess has placed upon the table of your Lordships' House. There was one point made in the discussion with regard to monopoly value. One noble Lord stated that the State had no right to the monopoly value, and that it had never parted with it. Under these circumstances I will turn to the Act of 1904 under which the monopoly value of all new licences is retained, and I am only sorry the noble Earl is not here, because I should have liked to have extracted from him some further explanation on that point. I will only make one reference to the remarks made by the noble and learned Lord on the back benches who spoke just before dinner. He was full of consideration for the moderate drinkers of this country, and he thought that insufficient attention was given to them in the Bill proposed by His Majesty's Government. I could not help wondering if the noble Lord had considered the fact that after all these reductions have taken place under this Bill there will be no less than 60,000 public-houses left in this country, and if he thinks a reduction of 90,000 to 60,000 licences will really spoil the jollity of the people of this country I cannot help wondering what kind of jollity it is to which the noble and learned Lord refers. I think there will be ample opportunity for every kind of jollity for the people of every class under this Bill.

Lord ROBERTSON: The noble Lord omits to notice that they are not all collected in one place.

Earl BEAUCHAMP: It is quite true that at present the 90,000 houses are not collected in one place; neither are the 60,000, and the reduction is not confined to one area either. The noble and learned Lord must have a somewhat ghastly idea of jollity. There is another point to which I wish to call attention, and it is one we may hear more of when some other measure comes before your Lordships' House. Complaints have been made by noble Lords opposite that the

Government do not give sufficient time to your Lordships' House to consider the measures sent from another place. Let me point out that while the Third Reading of this Bill took place on Friday last in another place, so full was the information in possession of noble Lords opposite that on Tuesday last they were sufficiently well informed that forthwith and without hearing any speeches in this House they indicated their desire and intention of rejecting this Bill. Under those circumstances I think noble Lords opposite will be somewhat embarrassed if they complain on a subsequent occasion that they are given insufficient time in this House to consider the measures brought before them by His Majesty's Government.

It is unnecessary for me to emphasise what is perhaps after all the underlying principle of this Bill. What I allude to is the human aspect which has hardly been touched upon except by the Bishop of London, who has had special opportunities of studying that side of the question. It is well-known that the crime, lunacy, and pauperism existing to-day are largely due to the influence of drink. The hospitals are largely filled from this cause, and there is hardly any form of crime, including cruelty to children, which does not arise from the same cause. There is scarcely any form of crime which your Lordships can call to mind in which drink does not play an important and determining part. All this is well-known to social reformers, who have been referred to by the most rev. Prelate to-night. I do not think that there is a single social reformer to be found outside your Lordships' House who will rejoice at the rejection of this Bill. In their view this measure was considered as a great blow struck for national righteousness. Noble Lords opposite have preferred by their rejection of the Biil rather to encourage that very influence which is at the bottom of most of the national evils which are corrupting our national life to-day. The responsibility of noble Lords opposite and of the noble Marquess is very great indeed, and after the speeches we have heard from the most rev. Primate and the right rev. Prelate I should have thought they would have found it almost impossible to justify their attitude to this Bill.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I do not propose to discuss at any length the defects of the Act of 1904, neither shall I enter into the *tu quoque* arguments which the noble Lord has addressed to my noble friend who moved this Resolution. I prefer to call the attention of the House to the important principles which are contained in this Bill. When the noble Earl rose to speak from the Government Bench, I felt sure he was about to address himself to that minute and detailed review of the criticism of the Bill which was offered last night by the noble Viscount. The House will recollect that the noble Viscount said that if he could obtain assurances from His Majesty's Government on certain points, he was prepared to support the Second Reading of the Bill. So far as we have gone, no single person who has spoken in favour of the Bill, with the exception of the Bishop of Hereford, has declared himself in favour of this measure as it stands. Lord Ribblesdale began his speech last night by offering a great many criticisms, and giving a great deal of valuable information to the Government with regard to the details in the Bill, which I hope the Government have marked, learned, and inwardly digested. The next speaker was the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has to-night announced himself as an active supporter of this Bill. But even the most rev. Primate admitted that with regard to the business part of the measure he did not feel himself very capable of offering criticisms, and he went so far as to suggest that he might support Amendments of one sort or another. I greatly regret that the most rev. Primate did not proceed and tell us what those Amendments were. Then the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, does not seem altogether to have pleased His Majesty's Government, although he has declared himself to be a strong supporter of the Second Reading of this Bill.

*EARL BEAUCHAMP: I made no such reference to the noble Earl on the cross benches.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. I think he will recollect that he said there was a noble Earl to-night who spoke from the cross benches, and for a long time he could not make up his mind whether he was for or against the Bill.

Earl BEAUCHAMP: I am sorry there has been a mistake, but I referred to the noble Viscount Lord St. Aldwyn, and the speech he made last night. [Cries of "Oh, oh."]

*The Earl of CREWE: Perhaps the noble Earl will allow me to explain what my noble friend said.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: I would much rather take the noble Lord's own version.

The Earl of CREWE: I beg pardon, but my noble friend stated that, like the noble Earl, he felt uncertain whether the noble Viscount was going to vote for the Second Reading or not.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: I know that the noble Lord who spoke for the Government referred to a noble Earl, but I will let it pass. The noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, said he was going to support the Second Reading, but what did he proceed to say? He said that he found fault with the Central Commission, and hoped the Government would not create any more of those Central Commissions. The noble Earl also said that while he approved of the time-limit he entirely disapproved of the mode in which the compensation was to be calculated under this Bill. I hold that I was rather puzzled by that part of his speech, because the time-limit and the mode of calculating compensation are so closely allied as to be practically indissoluble, and I could not understand how it was that the noble Earl was approving of the one and disapproving entirely of the other. Without in any way depreciating other speeches which have been made, I may say that up to the present time, in my opinion, the speech made by my noble friend Viscount St. Aldwyn has examined more closely than any other the details of the Bill; it has placed before His Majesty's Government more clearly than any other the respects in which many of us think the Bill is defective, and with regard to which we are anxious for an explanation. We have been asked why we did not ask for a compromise, but I would like to know is this the time to compromise? I would like to know when will the time for compromise come? Is it expected that my noble friend the Marquess of Lansdowne will offer compromises to the Government? If the Government have any compromises to offer, it is for them to bring them forward in a clear and definite manner which we can all understand. A good deal has been said about this unfortunate meeting at Lansdowne House, where this bellicose olive branch, which appears so much to have disturbed the noble Earl, was grown. I am afraid this is a matter into which it is quite unnecessary for me to go at this time of the night, but I can assure the noble Lord that there was nothing mysterious about that meeting. On the contrary, I think if the noble Lord had been present he would have learned a good deal, because he would have found that there are a great many peers sitting on this side of the House who were most anxious to read this Bill a second time if there was any possibility of amending it. The difficulty is that the Amendments which are necessary to make this measure acceptable go to the very root of the Bill, and it was not until there had been a long discussion that finally the noble Marquess proposed the course which nearly all present at that meeting concluded was the only one they could follow.

I do not know whether my noble friend Lord St. Aldwyn still hopes that the Government are going to offer any compromise which will enable him to vote for the Second Reading. I doubt myself very much whether they can or whether they will offer any compromise. There is very little hope of that. What did the Government offer in the way of compromise while this Bill was before the House of Commons? Was there any tone whatever of compromise? Was there any proposal at all in the direction of mitigating the great defects which are to be found in this Bill, some of which I am bound to say the promoters of the Bill themselves seem to admit? There is one grave omission to which the noble Earl who spoke just now referred—I mean the absence of any provision dealing with off-licences. At one time there was a provision in the Bill which included off-licences, but His Majesty's Government found that they did not know what the meaning of their own Amendment was, and as soon as they discovered that it brought existing off-licences under the Bill they declared that they meant nothing of the kind, and they hastily proceeded to withdraw it. Not only did they withdraw that clause, but they put words into the next section to say that under no circumstances was local option to apply to existing off-licences. It will be very interesting to know what was the reason for withdrawing the off-licences. Then there are the grocers' licences. The Opposition in this House have been accused of being in league with the brewers. I do not know that it will be altogether unfair if I say that it is just possible that the exclusion of off-licences from this Bill arises from some natural inclination on the part of the Government towards the grocer.

The principles of this Bill have been examined by the noble Viscount and by others so closely that it is not necessary for me to do more than call your Lordships' attention to one or two points which I think have hardly been sufficiently noticed in the course of this debate. This Bill is a measure to promote temperance, no doubt, but it is also a Bill which relates to the Exchequer and to obtaining money for the Exchequer. From the point of view of temperance, what difference does it make whether there is a time-limit or not if all the licences have to be resumed by the State? What difference does it make if the licences remain in the hands of those who at present hold them? I suppose there are to be some public-houses left. What difference does it make whether any of the remaining public-houses are in the hands of the publican or in the hands of the State from the point of view of temperance? Then there is another point. The Bill provides for a stereotyped reduction of 32,000 licences. I wonder whether any of your Lordships have really considered the amount of inconvenience which that must necessarily cause. Let me give the House an illustration. I can speak from my own experience of the past. In the jurisdiction of the licensing bench to which I belong there happens to be a little town with a population rather under 2,000. Four years ago in that town there were twenty or twenty-one licences in all, and now there are sixteen. That town accommodates not merely the 1,800 people who live there, but it is a market-town to which a large number of people come on market days. Under this Bill those sixteen licences will be reduced to four. I put it to your Lordships that the four houses which will be left under this Bill are pretty certain to be all of one sort, and they will be the higher class houses such as hotels and houses of that kind. It is a fact that a great number of the people who come into that town want to drink their glass of beer amongst their own class of society, and the people whom they want to meet. They do not want to come among the farmers and the grain-dealers and that sort of people. All I can say is that on the fair-day which occurs once a month, I can imagine the pandemonium which will exist if there are only four public-houses in that town. I entirely agree with my noble friend Lord Robertson and others that you can promote temperance far better by strong regulations applied to public-houses than by such proposals as are contained in this Bill. You can promote temperance better by regulating those houses than by abolishing them. As for the establishment of a Central Commission, which can know nothing whatsoever of the locality, I cannot conceive of any body which will be less able to produce a real improvement.

It has been said that this Bill restores the discretion to the justices of the peace. What did the Act of 1904 do in this respect? That Act said that the justices were to suggest to Quarter Sessions the houses which were to be abolished and that Quarter Sessions should pay the compensation. The authority of Quarter Sessions is done away with by this Bill. Under these circumstances how can it be said that this Bill really restores and gives increased discretion to the justices of the peace. What authority have the justices of the peace in regard to the statutory reduction? They are ordered to do certain things by the Act of Parliament, and they are compelled by this Central Commission to make the reduction provided for in the Act in any way that the Commission may please.

And then, after all is said and done, there comes in the operation of that beneficent local option. Local option is to override the magistrates, and how in the world anyone can say that this Bill, with clauses of that sort, restores liberty to the justices, I for one, cannot understand. But there is another objection to this Bill, and it is that it entirely breaks up all continuity of legislation. I am sorry that the Government, if we are to judge by their usual practice, considers this to be rather an advantage than otherwise. Unfortunately if there is a violent way of doing a thing and a quiet way, the Government almost invariably choose the violent method. This is the way in which they have dealt with all that in the past has been customary in legislation, and more especially that dealing with land, and the only misfortune is that their knowledge is not equal to their audacity in these matters. This Bill professes in some degree to proceed upon the Act of 1904, but how does it do it? It takes out of the Act of 1904 anything that happens to be convenient for the purpose of this new system. The Act of 1904 enacted that all redundant public-houses were to be reduced, and established a compensation levy for the purpose of compensating them. It also ordained that that levy was to be paid by the trade. Now what does this Bill do? It says that after fourteen or twenty-one years all licences are to belong to the State, and that during fourteen years there is to be a compensation levy upon this unfortunate trade from whom the whole of their property is to be taken away. Is there any conceivable reasons why members of the trade should be called upon to contribute in this way any more than your Lordships? Then there is this question of compromise. The noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, told us to-night that here was a grand opportunity for a compromise in regard to which we might make ourselves famous. Unfortunately the noble Earl's arguments appeared to me to be rather in support of the action which your Lordships have decided to take, because after what has happened in another place it is quite certain that the Government would not accede to any compromise either with regard to the Central Commission, the statutory reduction, the time-limit, or Schedule A as the basis of compensation. Unless the Government are prepared to make a compromise on those points it is utterly impossible that any of your Lordships with your present opinions can vote for the Second Reading of this Bill.

There were two possible courses open with regard to this Bill. One was to reject it on the Second Reading and the other was to read it a second time and then proceed to amend it. Whichever of those two courses was adopted the result was certain to be the same. It was merely a difference of procedure, and that is why I tell the House frankly I made up my mind after great consideration to support the Motion which has been proposed by my noble friend the Marquess of Lansdowne. I felt certain that there was no chance whatever of compromise on any of those principles of the Bill, and that unless it could be radically and fundamentally altered the only course for me to pursue was to support its rejection. Whichever of those two courses your Lordships had adopted the result would have been the same, although perhaps the criticisms would have been slightly different. If you decide to reject the Bill on the Second Reading it will be said, as has been said on some previous occasions, that your Lordships are enemies of temperance. On the other hand, suppose you elect to read the Bill a second time, and after amending it you find that the Government will not accept your Amendments? You will then be told that, having accepted the main principles of the Bill on the Second Reading, you have no right to propose Amendments which go to the root of those principles, and that really you are acting in a cowardly manner. You will be told that you hate this Bill, that you have always wanted to throw it out, and that you have taken an indirect and cowardly way of doing it. That is the only difference, so far as I can see, between trying to amend this

Bill and taking the course which the noble Marquess proposes. I can never assent to several of the principles in this Bill. I think you are not merely doing what is uncalled for by this measure, but you are doing what is unjust; and so far as I am concerned I shall give my vote unhesitatingly for the Amendment of the noble Marquess.

VISCOUNT GALWAY: My Lords, I do not intend that on this occasion my vote shall be misunderstood. I wish in the first place to point out that I do not belong to any syndicate connected with the trade, nor do I own any brewery shares. I do not propose at this late hour to enter into a discussion of the time-limit proposed by this Bill. On that point I am quite satisfied with the definition which has been given by my noble friend Viscount St. Aldwyn, and my noble and learned friend Lord Robertson, and others. What I do say is that the main reason why I am not prepared to vote for the Second Reading of this Bill is that the compensation clauses are most unfair and unjust. I do not wish to put a licence on the same footing as a freehold, but if you take away a man's property he has a right to demand to be paid the full price for it. I am afraid noble Lords opposite cannot feel well satisfied with the speeches of two of their spokesmen to-night. The noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, alluded to Gatton Park and what took place there before the Reform Bill, and he said that if property was taken by the State the person who owned it was entitled to compensation. I wonder why he did not allude to the famous "Coach and Horses" public-house connected with the War Office. I do not know whether that case has entered into the consideration of His Majesty's Ministers. Then we had the speech of the Bishop of Hereford, who talked a great deal about the crime that was caused by the trade carried on under off-licences. The noble Lord should not forget that the originator of off-licences was the late Mr. Gladstone. It is quite true that good intentions pervade all the remarks we have heard in favour of temperance from the right reverend Prelates, but they have never given us any information as to how this Bill is going to effect temperance at all beyond reducing licences. I wish to put before your Lordships this point. If all these public-houses are automatically reduced you will absolutely prevent working men in the country districts being able to get a glass of fresh beer. It is perfectly well-known that the only result of that will be that every working man who is not a teetotaller will deliberately set to work and get a bottle of spirits, probably of a fiery quality, and take it to his own house. There is no doubt that that will be very bad indeed, not only for the present, but for future generations also. It must be a bad thing if, instead of allowing facilities for working men to drink good wholesome beer in our country districts, you compel those who desire to take intoxicating liquors to have a bottle of spirits at home. I have never yet heard any remarks made to show why those who live in agricultural districts should not be allowed the fullest opportunity of obtaining wholesome beer. I would ask those who talk so much about temperance to remember that the working men in the country villages who are not teetotallers desire to have alcoholic drink, and it is better for them to take good pure wholesome beer than fiery spirits. It is also better that they should consume their beer in a well-controlled public-house rather than in a club. If there is one thing which to me will justify the vote I am going to give on this question it is the remark made by the right rev. Prelate, who said that privilege Amendments have no meaning whatever. We know perfectly well what would happen if we sanctioned the Second Reading of this Bill. We have had a sad experience of that kind of thing before. Your Lordships are aware of previous instances where Amendments have been made in this House, and the Government in the other House have immediately proposed their rejection. We know perfectly well that anything which might be done here would be a question of privilege, and the whole thing would be lost in amazement, because the British public do not understand privilege Amendments. I prefer to go to the country with a perfectly clear record, and my vote is going to be given against the Second Reading of this Bill, because it has not been proved by any speaker in this House that, with the solitary exception of the provision for the reduction of licences, this Bill is in any way a temperance measure. No other temperance argument has been brought forward, and this Bill is founded upon the principle of giving most unjust compensation for legitimate property, and that is simple, plain robbery.

LORD GLANTAWE: My Lords, the attempts which have been made before the introduction of this Bill to further the cause of temperance and moderate drinking have been of very great value to the working classes. Many of your Lordships will remember the state of things which existed before the Act of 1872 was passed. At that period drunkenness was very rife and trade was prosperous. Frequently, during periods when trade is prosperous, drinking takes place in the ratio of the amount of working men's earnings. The Act I have referred to has had a good effect amongst the working classes. The Sunday Closing Act of 1881 has also been of very great benefit, not only to the working classes but also to employers, and consequently to the State as well. Before the Sunday Closing Act of 1881 was passed all employers of labour know how difficult it was to get working men to attend to their duties on a Monday morning, but the passing of that Act had almost an immediate beneficial effect, and the work done in our different manufactories on Monday is now equal to that carried on upon any other day in the week. That has had a wonderful effect upon the cost of production and of the materials used, because it is a well-known fact, especially where furnaces are employed at enormous cost, a great waste used to take place on account of the men not turning up on Monday morning, and this used to add considerably to the cost of production. Although I shall give my vote for the Second Reading of this measure, I wish to state that there may be clauses in the Bill that need amendment, and on that score I am very sorry that your Lordships have deemed it right and proper to reject the Second Reading without attempting to make it into a workable Bill. I regret your Lordships have resolved to receive this measure in a contrary spirit to that in which it has been introduced by the Government. There are several important clauses in this Bill, and one of them is Clause 22, which gives the licensing justices the power of attaching conditions to the renewal of licences. One important part of that clause relates to Sunday closing, and it gives power to close public-houses during the whole of Sunday, or of still further limiting the hours during which public-houses may be open on Sundays. Another very important part of that clause is that no drink shall be supplied before eight o'clock in the morning. Those of us who have mixed amongst the working classes know how detrimental this habit of drinking in the early hours of the morning has been in very many places. Frequently people who work all through the night finish their work between five and six o'clock in the morning, and the fact that public-houses are open during those hours frequently gives working men a taste for drink which keeps them in the public-house pretty well the whole of the day instead of their going home to rest. The consequence is that they are almost unfit for the work they have to perform during the following night. Another important part of this clause is subsection (*g*) which proposes to close partly or wholly public-houses on election days more especially in regard to local elections. We know how very detrimental drinking is upon polling days. We know also what a large amount of drink is illegally consumed on those occasions. With them it is not so much a question whether the person they vote for is better qualified for carrying on the duties of a local administrator as whether he is able to satisfy their craving for drink. Drink frequently settles the election, and guides those who vote for the different candidates placed before them. Then there are limitations as to the power of the justices, and when it is proposed that they should grant licences conditionally no conditional licence can be granted without due notice being given. There are other clauses such as the penalty clauses for the non-performance of the conditions of licence.

I have watched this Bill very closely in its progress through the other

House, and I have read carefully many of the speeches made in another place, more especially those by the representatives of Labour. With regard to the latter speeches you will find, with scarcely a single exception, that every representative of Labour in the other House is in favour of this Bill, and they have all voted for it with the exception of a few who were unable to be present, and they took good care to pair in favour of the measure. I am sure your Lordships will agree with me when I say that no one is more qualified to decide upon what is for the benefit of the working classes than those who directly represent them in the House of Commons. I do not wish to find fault with the trade or with any of those who supply working men with drink. I know well from my long experience amongst them—having sat on the bench with them for many years—that there are some very excellent men among the licensed victuallers. There are also bad ones amongst them the same as there is in every other section of society. I do not wish to put any impediment in the way of people getting a moderate amount of drink. I know that in many cases it is absolutely necessary that they should be able to get it. I know a good many cases where working men have been teetotallers from their youth. I have heard it said in the course of this debate in your Lordships' House that it is impossible for a working man to perform his work properly without having a certain amount of drink. There are exceptions to that, and I know many worthy exceptions. But in the case of working men who cannot conduct themselves properly it is absolutely necessary that we should, as far as possible, limit the temptations offered to them to procure drink because it not only injures them physically, but it also forms a very expensive luxury. In the course of the debate one noble Lord said that many working men spend 6d. per day on beer. Another noble Lord said 6d. per day would not affect him very much, but he evidently forgets that to a working man who earns about 20s. or 25s. a week, and has a wife and family of three or four children to support, 6d. per day is a very serious item, and that money would be very much better applied to obtaining other comforts for the family than in being spent on drink. Therefore, I think it is, necessary that we should, as far as possible limit temptations to drink because in the experience of those who have mixed with working men the less temptations they have the better and more sober they remain. Personally, I am exceedingly sorry that your Lordships have deemed it proper to throw this Bill out on the Second Reading without giving it full consideration. I feel certain that the feeling which will be left in the minds of the majority of the people will be that your Lordships' House thinks more of the interests of the trade than of leading the people of this country into more temperate habits.

EARL WALDEGRAVE: On behalf of Lord Balfour of Burleigh I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned till to-morrow.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Twelve o'clock, till to-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 26th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL [LORDS].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY

Copy presented, of Report by the War Office on the steps taken during 1907 to provide Techincal Instruction to Soldiers to fit them for Civil Life [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Board of Trade under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 4172 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (MILITARY OPERATIONS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 25th November; *Mr. Bellairs*]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Urban District Council of Hindley, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Records (Colonial Office) (New Zealand Company). Copy of Schedule containing a list and particulars of Classes of Documents which have been removed from the Office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State having the Department of the Colonies, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sanitation at Ramsey.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if the Board received a report some two years ago on the sanitary conditions of Ramsey and the bad drinking water in the town; if such report was made by a member of the Royal Sanitary Institute, and if it was practically of the same character as the report recently issued by the medical officer of health of the Hunts County Council, wherein it was stated that there was no drinking water in the town fit for use, and that the sanitary arrangements were insanitary and dangerous; if complaints have been sent to the Local Government Board by residents of Ramsey; and, if so, why the Local Government Board has disregarded these complaints and report, and not taken action to compel the council to carry out the law.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Local Government Board received a copy of a report which was obtained by the Rural Housing and Sanitation Association in 1906 from an associate of the Royal Sanitary Institute as to the condition of certain houses in Ramsey, and which contained some observations as to the need of sewerage and water supply in the district. A copy of this report was also sent to the district council. Some complaint of nuisance was made by a resident in the town and the Board communicated with the district council with regard to the matter, but they have not received any such complaint of default on the part of the district council with respect to sewerage and water supply as would enable them to take compulsory action under the Public Health Act. I am, however, giving attention to the sanitary condition of the place.

Inquest on Blackburn Weaver.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he has now obtained the depositions taken at the inquest in the case of William Walsh, a weaver, of Blackburn, who died in the mission shelter on 20th October; and, if so, whether he has inquired into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have obtained a copy of the depositions and I am making inquiries with regard to the case.

Mullingar District Lunatic Asylum.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will ascertain from the audited accounts of the Mullingar District Lunatic Asylum, and state the total cost of that institution each year during the last twenty-five years, divided into establishment expenditure, such as permanent buildings, cost of repairs and maintenance, cost of upkeep, and law costs, if any; the amount received in each of those years from the Treasury, from each of the contributory counties, and from other sources; and the amount of debt now on the asylum and the rate at which it is arranged to be paid off.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have given directions for the preparation of the Return asked for by the hon. Member. It is not desirable to encumber the records of Parliament with such a lengthy Return, but the information will be forwarded to the hon. Member when received.

King's Road, Chelsea, Sub-Post Office.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the local desire that the sub-district Post Office at 23, King's Road, Chelsea, should remain open for business to at least 10 p.m.; whether he is aware that the town hall, which is practically in the centre of the borough and opposite this post office, is some 1,400 yards from the nearest office open after 8 p.m., and that some portions of Chelsea are more than 2,000 yards from any office open after this hour; and whether he will take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have received a representation on this subject from the Chelsea Borough Council, and the question is now engaging my attention.

Aldridge Colliery Accident.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to an accident that occurred at the No. 1 pit of the Aldridge Colliery Company, whereby Noah Wood lost his life and William James was so injured that he was removed in a critical condition to the Walsall hospital; to what was the accident due; will he make the necessary inquiries concerning this case; and whether he can state the number of accidents at this pit during the past five years, and also the number of deaths resulting therefrom.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have made inquiry with regard to this accident, and am informed by the inspector that it was caused by a fall of side which came away unexpectedly from between two slips during the repair of a road. The place had been examined a short time previously by the fireman, who thought it so hard that it would require to be blasted down. From 1st January, 1904, to the present date nineteen accidents have occurred above and below ground at this pit, of which six (including one surface accident) were fatal, resulting in six deaths. The number employed below ground is about 550, and the death rate over the five years is 1·8 per 1,000, which is very near the general death rate for the district.

Taxi-Cabs at London Railway Termini.

MR. RENTON (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether mechanically propelled vehicles possess the same privileges at London railway stations as those drawn by horses.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Yes, Sir. Neither Section 2 of the London Cab and Stage Carriage Act, 1907, which abolished the privileged cab system, nor any Orders made by me under that section, make any distinction between horse-drawn and motor cabs.

Unemployment in the United States.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the statistics on page 7 of Diplomatic and Consular Reports [Cd. 4035], United States, Trade of New York, June, 1908, apply to the whole of the United States or to the State of New York alone, and are there any official figures of unemployment for the United States generally; and will he state whether the Returns of unemployment in the *Labour Gazette* include only those members of trades unions who have benefit funds from which to draw and who are idle through lack of work, and do those Returns exclude those trade unionists who have no unemployed benefit funds or are idle from other causes than lack of work, and also do not take into account unskilled workmen or men in casual employment.

(*Answered by Sir H. Kearley.*) The statistics on page 7 of the Consular Report mentioned by the hon. Member relate to the City of New York only.

There are no official statistics of unemployment for the United States as a whole. The Returns of unemployed members of trade unions in the *Labour Gazette* are necessarily based on the information furnished by the trade unions paying unemployed benefit and relate only to such unions. They include those returned as idle from lack of work whether in receipt of benefit or not, and, in addition, those whose employment is temporarily suspended owing to bad weather, fires, failures, breakdowns, and similar causes, but not those who are directly affected by labour disputes or who are idle through sickness or accident. The Returns relate mainly to skilled workers.

Kenmare Estate Evicted Tenants.

MR. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Estates Commissioners' representatives paid several visits to Killarney recently to inquire into the claims of evicted tenants on the Kenmare estate; will he say if he has made a report on the several cases inquired into; whether the Commissioners have yet taken any steps to relieve, by way of grants, the tenants who have been reinstated on derelict farms; and whether they have taken, or propose to take, any steps to secure the reinstatement of evicted tenants whose farms have been grabbed on this estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received their inspector's report on these cases, and will consider the making of grants to such tenants as have been reinstated and have signed purchase agreements. The applications of those evicted tenants whose farms are now occupied by other tenants, and who are deemed suitable, will be considered in the allotment of untenanted land to be acquired by the Commissioners.

Irish University Charters.

MR. GWYNN (Galway): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what reason can be assigned for the delay in issuing the charters under the Irish University Act; and whether he realises that such delay may probably retard the period at which the University can come into being.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The charters have now been signed, and they will be issued as soon as the necessary Letters Patent are prepared. I have directed that all possible despatch shall be used.

Teachers' Salaries.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the average salary of trained assistant teachers in Dublin, and the average salary of trained assistant teachers in London and Edinburgh; do the assistant teachers in Irish national schools perform work inferior to that of English and Scottish assistant teachers; whether, though assistant teachers in Irish schools pass the same examinations and possess the same qualifications as principal teachers, they never, under any circumstances, receive promotion, no matter what their qualifications, ability, or length of service; whether he is aware that in Dublin married assistant teachers must pay from one-third to one-half their salaries for house rent alone, and in the case of unmarried assistants the high rent for rooms, etc., pressess equally hard; and whether he will inquire into the actual work performed by the assistants and their responsibility for this work, and take steps to see that they are rewarded in proportion, and that all receive at least a living wage.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the average salaries from State sources of trained assistant teachers in national schools in Dublin (excluding fees for extra branches and evening school work) is £86 13s. 3d. for men, and £74 10s. 4d. for women. For information with regard to the salaries of assistant teachers in London and Edinburgh I must refer the hon. Member to the Ministers representing the Departments concerned. I have no reason to think that the work of assistant teachers in Ireland is not fully equal to that done in England and Scotland. Assistant teachers in Dublin rank as a rule in the third grade. I have no means of obtaining information as to the house rents which they pay; and I cannot undertake to make the inquiry suggested in the concluding paragraph of the Question.

Mountjoy Prison—Death of Richard O'Brien.

MR. NANNETTI: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the fact that a prisoner, named Richard O'Brien, who was committed to Mountjoy prison on 23rd ultimo, died within a few hours of his admission without any medical attendance, notwithstanding that there are two resident medical officers attached to the said prison; and if he can explain why both the medical officers were absent from duty upon the occasion referred to, and what steps, if any, have been taken to prevent a recurrence of such neglect; and whether the governor or deputy-governor took any steps to provide the deceased with any stimulants or other medical aid before death.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Richard O'Brien was admitted to Mountjoy prison at 1.30 p.m. on the day mentioned and was then apparently in normal health. He was found in a moribund state at 4.35 p.m., and died in a quarter of an hour from heart disease. One resident medical officer was on leave, his substitute went off duty at four o'clock, and the other medical officer did not return till 5.28 p.m. The coroner's jury expressed the opinion that no doctor could have saved the prisoner's life, but that the prison should never be without a doctor. Orders to that effect were, and are, in force; the neglect to comply with them has been dealt with, and steps have been taken to ensure their strict observance for the future. No stimulants were administered. The hospital warder obtained brandy for the purpose from the hospital, but found the prisoner dead on his return.

Food and Drug Adulteration in Ireland.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many samples were taken under the Food and Drugs Act in Ireland for the years 1905-6-7, distinguishing between solid and liquid; how many prosecutions were instituted, and with what result; how many public analysts are employed, what salaries are they paid, and can he say if the county councils contribute to the expense of this department; and whether the work of analysis is entirely performed by the public analyst whose signature is appended to the certificates given in evidence in prosecutions under the Food and Drugs Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have no information as to the first part of the Question. There is a public analyst for each county and borough. These analysts are appointed and paid by the respective councils. Some of them are paid by salaries varying from £5 to £300 per annum, others by fees, and in a few cases payment is made partly by fees and partly by salary. The Board are not aware of the arrangements made by the analysts for the discharge of their duties.

Kilrush Incendiary Fires.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of two incendiary fires in the neighbourhood of Kilrush on Saturday morning last; and whether any arrests have been made in connection with these occurrences.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police authorities inform me that on the night of the 20th November twenty-three tons of hay and some oats, the property of Patrick Fitzpatrick, were burnt. In the same neighbourhood, and at about the same time, some hay, the property of Margaret Molony, was also burnt. A claim for compensation has been lodged in the former case, and it cannot t this stage be said whether either of the fires was or was not the work of an incendiary. The police are investigating the cases. No arrests have been made.

Holycross Disturbances.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, as a result of an alleged demonstration in connection with the breaking-up of a grazing ranch at Holycross, County Tipperary, eight men, all respectable farmers, were arrested in their beds at two o'clock in the morning by a force of 200 armed constabulary; whether he is aware that this action on the part of the authorities has aroused indignation and exasperated the feelings of the people in the locality; can he explain why proceedings of an exceptional kind were taken against these men and why the privacy of their homes was invaded in the dead of night; was there any attempt on their part to evade the ordinary processes of the law; and, if not, will he see that in future the ordinary practices of civil administration are not departed from in cases of this kind.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The eight men referred to were arrested on a charge of riot and unlawful assembly. Prompt measures were necessary to prevent further disorder, and the arrests were made on the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown. The proceedings were strictly in accordance with the ordinary law and have my entire approval. I have no intention of giving any directions to the police to act differently in future should a similar riot occur in the locality or elsewhere.

Pension Regulations.

Mr. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that all relief given to a husband for or on account of his wife shall by the Poor Law Act, 1834, be considered to be relief given to the husband; and whether, in the event of a pensions committee granting a pension to a married woman on the ground that she cannot therefore be disqualified under the section creating the pauper disqualification by any receipt of relief on the part of her husband, he is now in a position to state whether he will be prepared to confirm the action of such a committee on appeal.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am advised that poor relief afforded to or for an applicant for a pension would disqualify the applicant. If, therefore, relief is given to a husband for or on account of his wife, the wife would be disqualified.

Supplies for Irish Government Offices.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that only ink made in Ireland is used in Irish Government Departments, he will explain why this practice obtains in Irish Departments and why a similar rule is not followed in the supply of articles for other Government Departments.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The practice in regard to the supply of ink to public offices in Ireland, which is correctly stated by the hon. Member, has been in force for many years. I understand, however, that the prices paid are substantially those ruling in the open market. It would not be desirable to extend this rule to the supply of articles generally to Government Departments, whether in Great Britain or Ireland.

Scottish Income-Tax Commissioners' Clerks.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the clerks to the Commissioners of Income-Tax in Scotland are in any way paid upon results, or receive a percentage on the amount of income sought out or passing through their hands; and, if so, will he say what are the arrangements with these clerks.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The Answers to the first and second parts of the Question are in the negative; the third does not arise.

Chatham Dockyard.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if it is proposed to dredge the channel to the dockyard at Chatham to such a depth as will allow of ships of the "Dreadnought" class to be docked and repaired there.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The reply to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Proposed Floating Dock in the Medway.

Mr. FELL: To ask the First Lord o the Admiralty if it is proposed to build and maintain a floating dock in the Medway capable of containing the largest men-of-war; and, if so, where will such dock be placed, and when is it estimated it will be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) No decision has been arrived at in regard to a floating dock.

Hayti Disturbances.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether any British cruiser has yet been ordered to proceed to Hayti with a view to affording assistance to British subjects there during the present disturbances; and, if not, whether such orders will be given at once.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I have nothing to add to the reply given to the hon. Member this afternoon on the same subject by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

New Destroyers.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what is the reason of the new destroyers being so much inferior in size, speed, and armament to the latest "Tribal" class of destroyer.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Board of Admiralty do not admit that the new destroyers are inferior in size or armament to those of the "Tribe" class; as regards speed they are designed to meet fully all the requirements for which they are intended.

Naval Campaign Plans.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty who is the officer responsible for the preparation of the plan or plans of a naval campaign; and what, if any, official position does he hold.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Under the direction of the Board, and in particular of the First Sea Lord, the preparation of such plans is part of the functions of the Director of Naval Intelligence.

Professor Marshall's Memorandum.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Professor Marshall's Memorandum on the Fiscal Policy of International Trade was revised and partly rewritten between 2nd June last, when it was agreed that the document should be laid upon the Table, and its publication.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the prefatory note prefixed to the Memorandum. Mr. Marshall there states that he has revised the Memorandum slightly, added some explanations, and rewritten the discussion of the relations between England and her Dependencies contained in Sections 80–82, but that in other respects the Paper remains substantially as it was originally written.

Old-Age Pensions Act Administration.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the right of an applicant for an old-age pension to an opportunity of being heard by the local pension committee in cases of doubt cannot be fully exercised owing to the age and infirmity of many applicants and their inability to travel to any meeting place, and that thereby difficulty is being experienced in rural districts in carrying out the intentions of Parliament in this respect; and whether, in order to assist local pension committees to obtain an opportunity for the applicant of being heard by a sub-committee or some person or persons acting on behalf of the committee, he will withdraw or modify the regulation which forbids any payment of travelling expenses of a committee or sub-committee out of the Exchequer grant.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have not received any complaints with reference to this matter and, unless real hardship could be shown to arise, I should not be prepared to take the course suggested, which would mean, I fear, a serious increase in the proportion for the grant for old-age pensions which would be diverted from the payment of pensions to meeting administrative expenses.

Irish Land Purchase Sinking Fund.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the amount of the sinking fund paid on purchases under the Irish Land Purchase Acts of 1885, 1891, and 1896, up to the year ended March, 1908; at what rate of interest is this money invested; whether, at the end of each decadal period of revision regard is had to the interest received during the previous ten years before deciding on the rate of reduction to be given to the tenant purchasers under each of those Acts; and what is the rate of reduction given in the last decadal revision under each of those Acts.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The sinking fund paid to 31st March, 1908, on purchases under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1885, amounted to £1,791,075. This represents the balance of annuity instalments at 4 per cent. on the amount of the advance outstanding after deducting interest at 3⅛ per cent. The advances under this Act were made from the Local Loans Fund, and the rate of interest is not subject to variation. Advances under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Acts, 1891 and 1896, were made in Two and Three-quarter per Cent. Guaranteed Land Stock, and are repayable by an annuity of 4 per cent., of which £2 15s. per cent. is required for interest on the stock, and the balance of £1 5s. per cent. is accumulated for the purpose of replacing the stock. The rate of accumulation is based upon the actual price at which the stock can be purchased; and under the Treasury rules the rate varies from time to time, so as to give the tenant-purchasers the full benefit of the market price of the stock being below par. The average rate of accumulation at the present time is approximately £2 19s. 5d. per cent., and is applied on the occasion of each decadal revision. Up to 31st March, 1908, the accumulated sinking fund amounted to £1,112,003, in addition to which Land Stock to the amount of £1,019,031 had been cancelled. As regards the rate of reduction given in the last decadal revision, this is a matter for the Land Commission; and I would suggest that the hon. Member should address himself on the point to the Chief Secretary.

Wine Duties.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether revision of the wines duties is under consideration in view of the unequal pressure of the present duties upon light wines.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am prepared to consider any representations my hon. friend may be good enough to make to me on the subject of these duties. But I fear I can give him no information as to future Budget proposals.

Irish Union Returns.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that clerks of unions in Ireland are from time to time called upon to furnish long Returns to this House, involving expense on the guardians, to whom they look for payment; whether he is aware that the New Ross board of guardians has recently objected to further payments to their officials for this purpose; and whether, as the Royal Commissions and Parliamentary Committees for whom these Returns are ordered are appointed for Imperial purposes, the Treasury will in future recoup the officials concerned and not put it a charge on local rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) My attention has not been previously directed to the subject. But I cannot admit that Parliament is precluded from calling for information to be furnished by local authorities when such information is required in the public interest, and especially when it relates to inquiries in which the boards of guardians are specially concerned, without undertaking to make additional payments to cover any cost that may be incurred.

Irish Pension Officers' Instructions.

Mr. P. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware if instructions have been issued to pension officers in Ireland to disallow claims for old-age pensions in cases where the applicant has been in a union hospital for any period since 1st January, 1908; whether he is aware that, under existing conditions in Ireland, the poor, in cases of illness, must of necessity obtain medical relief in the union dispensary or hospital; and whether, seeing that if this instruction is enforced it will penalise a large number of industrious persons who are entitled to an old-age pension who may be compelled to enter a union hospital, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Pension officers have no power to disallow claims, but they are of course bound to report against any claim in the case of which disqualification appears to arise. Whether relief of the kind referred to in the Question would disqualify depends upon the facts of the particular case, which the pension officer must report to the committee and upon which the committee will decide, subject to appeal to the Local Government Board.

Scottish Church Registers.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether instructions have been issued to pension officers to search free of cost the registers of the Established Church of Scotland, whether preserved locally or in the Register House in Edinburgh; and whether he will issue similar instructions to such officers to search the records belonging to dissenting churches, so that preferential treatment will not be give to any person on account of their creed.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Arrangements have been made under which specially appointed Inland Revenue officers are allowed to search, free of charge, the registers kept at the Register Office, Edinburgh, for evidence of age of applicants for old-age pensions on the request of pension officers. I have no power to require access to registers kept locally.

Cork Barracks.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that, although artisans and labourers employed at the Cork barracks have not technically been dismissed by the military authorities, they have been discharged by the triennial contractors, owing to the military authorities having allotted to the field company of the Royal Engineers a large proportion of the incidental work hitherto executed by civilian workmen; whether the field company would be sufficiently employed on field works at Moore Park and Kilworth camp, without taking the places of Cork working men at reduced wages; and whether the War Office, having pledged themselves to aid in coping with unemployment, they will withdraw these soldiers from competition with civilian workers at rates of pay inconsistent with the Fair Wages Resolution of this House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The triennial contractor has given the military authorities no information on the subject of discharging men, nor has he made any complaint about the employment of men of the Royal Engineers. It appears on inquiry that an extra number of hands have been recently employed by the contractor to complete arrears of work, and that the probable difference of employment caused by employing the Royal Engineers on their recognised work will in the long run be small. The company in question could not be employed at Moor Park or Kilworth, as there is no accommodation for them at those places.

Territorial Artillery Units.

Earl WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many Territorial artillery units are still short of their complement of guns, and what is the total number of guns required and the total number issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) 154 units are still short of their full complement of guns, twenty-eight having received their full supply. 728 guns are required and 330 have been issued. In addition, seventy-eight 12-pounder breechloading field guns have been issued for training pending the completion of the 15-pounder equipment. The batteries will be fully equipped with guns by the end of this financial year.

Irish Land Purchase Bonuses.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether bonuses at the rate of 12 per cent. will be paid under the Irish Land Act, 1903, to vendors whose agreements have been lodged with the Commissioners between 1st and 24th of November in this year.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would ask the hon. Member to await the circulation of the Irish Land Bill.

Elstree Parish Council Allotments.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that on 14th November, 1907, the Local Government Board wrote the parish council of Elstree that they had been advised by the Law Officers of the Crown that the expenses referred to in Section 2 (2) of the Allotments Act, 1887, while including the interest payable upon the purchase money, do not include the annual instalments of principal or payments to a sinking fund in cases where the land has been acquired by means of a loan; and whether, in view of the statement of the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, as stated by the President of the Local Government Board in reply to a Question on 21st June, 1908, and of the fact that on page 2 of Leaflet No. 215, issued by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, it is stated under the head of rent that the rents to be charged allotment holders will be fixed at sums sufficient to cover the expenses incurred in providing the allotment, such as the purchase money or rent paid by the local authority for the land, etc., he will state on what authority the Board make the last statement.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board are aware of the communication from the Local Government Board to which my right hon. friend refers. It was based on an opinion given by the Law Officers in 1888, from which the present Law Officers dissented in 1907 on a further case submitted to them.

Anæsthetics at the Metropolitan Hospital.

Mr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to an inquest held on a boy named Alfred Lebathe, aged twelve years, who died at the Metropolitan Hospital during the administration of an anæsthetic and before an operation was commenced; and whether he has had any answer to his communication with the British Medical Council as to the advisability of in future requiring that the administration of anæsthetics should form a part of the curriculum of a medical student.

Mr. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the repeated statements of the coroner for the City of London that only a small proportion of deaths occurring under anæsthesia in private practice come to the notice of the registrar or coroner; whether the annual Return of the Registrar-General shows that an average of three deaths while under the influence of an anæsthetic occur in the hospitals of England and Wales each week; and whether he will consider the advisability of appointing either a Commission or making a grant to the Royal Society and asking that Society to appoint a committee to inquire into all the facts of deaths under anæsthesia, and to advise generally as to the conditions to be observed and regulations to be carried out when an anæsthetic is administered.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I will answer these two Questions together. My attention has been drawn to several statements on this subject, including that of the coroner for the City of London, to the figures in the Registrar-General's Report, and to many cases of inquests on persons who have died under anæsthetics. The Lord President of the Council, through whom I communicated with the General Medical Council, informs me that he understands a reply may be expected in a very few days from that body, which is now in session. As I have stated before, the question of holding a formal inquiry must be postponed, at any rate, till I know what action the medical authorities are prepared to take.

Telegraphists at Race Meetings.

MR. COOPER: To ask the Postmaster-General whether the Post Office send a special staff of telegraphists to race meetings; and, if so, how many were sent to the Epsom racecourse on Derby Day, 1908, and to the Doncaster racecourse on the St. Leger Day, 1908; whether he can say in what building the telegraph office is situated on a racecourse, whether the Post Office hires the room or whether the racecourse authorities make a payment for the facilities offered; and whether the telegrams to the Press giving the betting and state of odds receive the usual Press rebate.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Post Office sends a special staff to all important race meetings; sixty-four men were sent to Epsom on Derby Day and sixty-two to Doncaster for the St. Leger. The racecourse authorities provide the office free; it is usually either in or adjoining the grand stand. Messages sent to the Press under the usual regulations go at the Press rates prescribed by Parliament; the Postmaster-General has no authority to discriminate against certain items of news such as those giving the state of the odds.

Racing Telegrams.

MR. COOPER: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state how many telegrams were received at and despatched from the temporary telegraph office on the racecourse at Newmarket, on 14th and 28th October, 1908; whether he can say whether these telegrams were sent to and despatched by bookmakers and related to bets; and whether the Post Office incurred any financial loss by establishing offices on this racecourse on these days.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) On 14th October, Czarevitch Day, the numbers were: 872 ordinary telegrams received at the grand stand; 3,772 ordinary telegrams despatched from the grand stand; 636 Press telegrams despatched from the grand stand. On the 28th, Cambridgeshire Day: 773 ordinary telegrams received at the grand stand; 3,372 ordinary telegrams despatched from the grand stand; 561 Press telegrams despatched from the grand stand. I can give no information as to the contents of these telegrams. No financial loss was incurred.

Beri-Beri Report.

MR. COOPER: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received the Report of the Special Committee of the Royal College of Physicians on the subject of beri-beri on merchant ships; and, if so, when will it be published.

(*Answered by Sir H. Kearley.*) A Report by the Committee of the Royal College of Physicians on beri-beri has been received, but it contains no very definite conclusions on the subject and the Board of Trade do not propose to publish it. The Committee suggested that a Commission which is at present at work at Quala Lumpur on the subject of beri-beri might throw some light on the matter, and the Board of Trade are awaiting the Report of that Commission.

Licences for Motor Vehicles.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the number of licences for motors and vehicles drawn by motors and licences for hackney motors and vehicles drawn by motors, excluding under each head motor bicycles and tricycles, respectively, issued by the Board of Inland Revenue during the year 1907 and during the period 1st January to 30th September, 1908.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The total number of licences for motors or vehicles drawn by motors for the year ended 31st December, 1907, was 40,902, and for hackney motors was 14,666. These figures exclude motor bicycles and tricycles. The corresponding figures for the nine months ended 30th September, 1908, are not yet available.

Antrim Royal Garrison Artillery.

COLONEL M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War why Carrickfergus, the head-quarters of the Antrim Royal Garrison Artillery, has not been placed on the basis of a depot, the same as the twenty infantry battalions specially selected to drill their recruits for six months; whether there are at present seventy-two recruits there, besides twenty-eight of a permanent staff, with only two officers, one, the adjutant, frequently away on other duties, the second officer having a little over two years service; and whether it is the intention to call up an instructor of artillery to instruct these recruits in their duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Carrickfergus is the head-quarters of the Antrim Royal Garrison Reserve Artillery, and the recruits drill at the head-quarters. It is not a depot, as it merely takes the recruits for this artillery unit. There are at present seventy-four recruits drilling there, besides the permanent staff. In compliance with the request of the commanding officer for assistance one subaltern has been allowed, the recruits being under seventy-five in number; and this is in accordance with the proportion formerly allowed under the Militia Regulations.

Royal Engineer Staff Removal Expenses.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now recommend the payment of removal expenses to members of the staff for Royal Engineer services or to make an allowance in respect of such expenses, as is done in the case of members of the Army Accounts branch in the War Department and to public servants in the Admiralty, Office of Works, and Inland Revenue Departments.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question of removal expenses has not yet been finally decided.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the officers of the staff for Royal Engineer services form a branch of the Royal Engineers, or whether they are a separate and independent organisation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The staff for Royal Engineer services is not part of the corps of Royal Engineers, but is a separate branch for the execution of works and, therefore, part of the Department of the Director of Works and Fortifications, under the Master General of the Ordnance.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Indian Reforms.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will arrange that this House shall receive a statement regarding the intentions of His Majesty's Government towards Indian reform simultaneously with the House of Lords; and whether he will afford this House an opportunity of discussing the same this session.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The Secretary of State for India hopes to be able to make a statement on Indian policy on or about December 14. He will at the same time lay Papers before Parliament, comprising proposals of the Government of India, and his own reply. A very short Bill will be necessary, and we shall present it next session. That seems to be the best occasion for discussion here, when Members will have had time to consider the Papers, and their reception in India.

DR RUTHERFORD: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think that it would be fairer to this House to give it an opportunity for discussing the statement of December 14th on the same day as it is made?

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir; I think not. The Secretary of State will make his statement separately.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman see so far as possible that matters of great public interest shall be communicated first to this House rather than to the House of Lords?

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir. I feel that quite as strongly as any Member of the House of Commons, but when the responsible Minister is in the House of Lords it is only natural that the first statement should be made in that place.

Ceylon Indian Recruiting Agency.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Ceylon Government subsidises the Ceylon Indian recruiting agency, which, therefore, is placed in a better position to compete with South Indian labour agencies and South Indian planters; and, if so, whether he will inquire into the matter in view to assist the South Indian planters, or take such steps as circumstances may require.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): The Secretary of State has not received any representations from India on this subject, but as at present advised he is not prepared to urge that aid should be given out of Indian revenues to South Indian labour agencies on the ground that the Ceylon Government gives a subsidy to the Ceylon labour agency.

*Mr. REES: Is it convenient that free trade and protection should be such near neighbours with such common interests?

Mr. BUCHANAN said he hoped India would not follow a bad example.

Education in India.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the manifestations of the results of the education at present given, the Government of India contemplates any drastic change in the existing system.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The general educational policy of the Government of India is declared in their Resolution of 11th March, 1904, and the Secretary of State is not aware that they intend to introduce any drastic change in that policy.

Conconada Police Punitive Force.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a punitive police force has been quartered on the town of Conconada in consequence of certain riots which occurred therein; whether, seeing that under Clause 5, Section 15, of the Police Act of 1861, provision is made for the exemption of any class of the inhabitants from liability to bear any portion of the cost of such force, he will say whether the European merchants in the town lie under any suspicion of being party to the riots; and if not, why the local government has not exercised the power of exemption conferred on it by the above-mentioned provision of the law.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Government of Madras have power to exempt any class of the community from liability to share the cost of the additional police quartered at Coconada. The Secretary of State has no information as to how they have exercised that power; he considers that the matter should be left to their discretion.

*Mr. REES: Does the hon. Gentleman think it equitable that when a riot is made by natives of India from whom no money levy can be made, the Europeans who are the victims should have to pay the expense of the punitive force?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I presume the Madras Government are satisfied with the method of distributing expense.

*Mr. REES: I do not think the Europeans are.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): We will send you out again.

Rhodesian Big Game Preserves.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether, in the Lomagundi district of Southern Rhodesia, it has been decided by the officials of the British Chartered South Africa Company to exterminate all the big game; whether in pursuance of this policy hunters are allowed to destroy the game to an unlimited extent for the purpose of selling the meat, horns, and tusks; whether one of the few remaining herds of elephants has been completely wiped out; whether the preservation of species is an Imperial concern; whether the officials of the Chartered Company have the power, without reference to the Colonial Office, to order or permit the total destruction of the game over vast areas of British territory; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Administrator of Southern Rhodesia in April last authorised the destruction of elephants in the district of Lomagundi except within the Urungwe game sanctuary. He has power to do this under an Ordinance of 1906, when he is satisfied that such destruction is in the interest of public safety. Complaints of the damage and danger caused by these elephants have been made for some time past. The Secretary of State is not in a position to interfere with the exercise of the discretion which the law has vested in the local administration.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD; I presume the Colonial Office put some limit on the destruction of these animals?

COLONEL SEELY: We have to protect that species as we have also to protect human lives.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the Under-Secretary aware that these elephants are more respectable animals than the persons by whom they are destroyed?

[No Answer was returned.]

Disturbances in Hayti.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps are being taken to secure protection for the lives and property of British subjects during the present disturbances in Hayti.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): His Majesty's Consul-General in Hayti has reported that a revolution had broken out at Aux Cayes on the southern coast of the Republic, but he has not intimated that there is any danger to British subjects or interests, nor has he asked for the presence of a man-of-war. No steps have, therefore, been taken for the moment to send one. His Majesty's ship "Scylla" is due to visit Port-au-Prince in the ordinary course on December 9th, and unless something unforeseen occurs, it does not seem necessary to anticipate that date.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has any information as to whether any of the Powers are sending or have sent ships for the protection of their subjects?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not heard of ships being sent by other Powers.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): Will not the right hon. Gentleman reconsider his decision as a precautionary measure?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Perhaps the hon. Member will give me information which will at least show that it is desirable to take any exceptional steps in the present circumstances.

Continental Education Laws.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the provisions of Clause 2 of the Education Bill, he can procure a Report from His Majesty's Minister at Berne and the British consul at Lausanne as to the general result in practice of the education law of the Canton de Vaud passed in May 1906; whether, with reference to Clause 3 of the Bill, he can obtain a Report from His Majesty's Minister at Munich as to the operation of the law in force in Bavaria in respect of associations; and can he obtain a Report from His Majesty's Minister at the Hague with reference to the operation of the provisions of the Education Acts of Holland, which correspond to the provisions of Clause 2 of the Bill.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Instructions will be sent to His Majesty's representatives at the places named to furnish, if possible, the information desired by the hon. Member.

MR. BOLAND: Will it be possible to have this information before the Committee Stage of the Education Bill is concluded?

SIR EDWARD GREY: All I can say is that I will get the information as soon as I can, but I cannot promise it will be in time for that.

Persia.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether there was any serious danger to lives or property of foreign subjects in Persia before the Parliament was dispersed and the Constitution destroyed by Colonel Liakhoff and his Cossacks.

SIR EDWARD GREY: There was the danger of general disorder and bloodshed, but it was not thought that foreigners were in special danger.

*MR. REES: Does the right hon. Gentleman accept the statement that the Constitution was destroyed by Colonel Liakhoff, and are these Cossacks Persian subjects?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Cossacks were Persian subjects, and acted under the orders of the Shah; but I do not make myself responsible for any statements other than those which I make.

Russian Officers in the Shah's Service.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state how many Russian officers on the active list are now in the service of the Shah of Persia; and whether any and, if any, how many British officers on the active list are in the service of the Shah.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have to refer the hon. Member to the reply made to the hon. Member for North Hackney on November 2nd. According to recent information, the officers now number five. The reply to the last Question is in the negative.

Persia—The New Constitution.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the refusal of the Shah of Persia to act on the advice of the British and Russian agents in reference to the granting of a Constitution, the Russian officers now in the service of the Shah will be withdrawn.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The last phase is that the Shah is going to give a Constitution, and the contingency mentioned does not, therefore, arise in answer to this Question and that of the hon. Member for Ripon. The Russian Government must deal with Russian officers as they think proper. I should certainly not admit that our dealings with British officers were to be influenced by pressure applied through a foreign Parliament; I imagine that other Governments have the same feeling; and the questions put on this subject by the hon. Member for Ripon seem to me calculated to defeat their own object, if that is their object, in so far as they have any effect at all.

MR. DILLON: Can the right hon. Gentleman give any information as to the character of the Constitution?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No, Sir; nor do I think it is for us to decide its character.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: May I ask the date of the last phase?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I think two or three days ago; at any rate, very recently.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): Is it to be a new Constitution or a revival of the old Constitution?

SIR EDWARD GREY: That is covered by the Answer which I have given. I am not prepared to be responsible for the internal affairs of Persia.

The Shah's Promise.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Shah of Persia promised the Governments of Great Britain and Russia that a Constitution would be granted the Persian people; and whether such promise was given since the *coup d'etat* of June 1908.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have to refer the hon. Member to the reply given to the Question asked by the hon. Member for North Hackney on 2nd November.

Papers on Persia.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of recent events, he can now consent to lay Papers on the affairs of Persia upon the Table of the House.

MR. O'GRADY: May I also ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any representations have been made to the Shah respecting the grant of a Constitution, such as is desired by the Nationalists, and an amnesty to those who resisted the *coup d'etat* of June, 1908, prior to the recent decision of the Shah not to grant a Constitution; and, if so, will Papers concerning such representations be laid upon the Table of the House.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As I have already stated, representations have been made from time to time. I could, of course, publish Papers about Persia, but they would contain very unfavourable comments upon the action of the Shah and his ministers, and also upon the conduct of the Mejliss. I am sure they would not give pleasure to any party of the Persians, and I do not think the publication would be helpful to Persia, or that any public interest would be served by it.

Representations to the Shah of Persia.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, before bringing pressure to bear, in concert with His Majesty's Government, upon the Shah of Persia in favour of the revival of the Persian Constitution, the Government of Russia is taking steps to recall Colonel Liakhoff, who was instrumental in the suppression of that Constitution; and how it is proposed to persuade the Shah of the identity of aims pursued by the two Powers while this Russian officer continues in the exercise of the important functions which he fills in Persia at the present time.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have already answered this Question in a reply given to the hon. Member for East Mayo.

MR. LYNCH: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of my Question?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I do not think that is a Question which I am called upon to answer. His Majesty's Government are responsible for the policy they pursue.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: As far as Persia is concerned, are the English and Russian Governments one and the same?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The two Governments have joined in representations to the Shah to carry out his own pledges given to his own people with regard to the Constitution. I have been somewhat doubtful with regard to that step, because it is a departure from the strict letter of policy of non-intervention. But, on the other hand, if the present disorder in Persia is continued, there is still greater risk of intervention; and the course which we have adopted has, therefore, been chosen as the lesser of two evils.

Conduct of Police Inquiries.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether inquiries with reference to the case of Mrs. Penn Gaskell and Miss Smith, made subsequently to 4th November last, have shown that the information supplied by the police was erroneous in several material particulars; and whether, in view of the desirability in the public interest that cases of this nature should be submitted to independent investigation, he will take steps as soon as may be to give effect to the recommendation of the Royal Commission upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police that an officer duly qualified by a knowledge of the law and experience in legal proceedings, acting under the direct superintendence of the Chief Commissioner, should be appointed for the purpose of dealing with complaints against the police by private persons and conducting inquiries into them.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The information supplied by the police, and given in reply to my hon. friend's Question on the 4th. of November, was erroneous in one particular. The woman who was in the waiting room when these ladies were brought to the Police Court was charged with being a prostitute. The gaoler had made a mistake as to the particular woman who had been in the room during the fifteen or twenty minutes that these ladies were there. The mistake was not unnatural, seeing that when inquiry was made of him, ten days had elapsed since the day in question, and no less than seventy-four charges had been dealt with on that day. On the other hand, as I have already pointed out privately to my hon. friend, some undoubted misstatements have been made, both to me, and in letters to the Press, by those interested on behalf of these ladies. The recommendations of the Police Commission are now under my consideration, and in particular the question how effect can best be given to the important suggestion mentioned in my hon. friend's Question.

MR. G. GREENWOOD: Will the right hon. Gentleman ascertain if the door of the cell was not locked some part of the time the ladies were detained?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am informed it was closed, but not locked.

Incendiary Furze Fires in Guernsey.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the sentence of fourteen days' hard labour passed upon nine lads at the Guernsey Court for setting fire to the furze on l'Ancresse Common on Guy Fawkes Day; whether he can state the age of these lads; and whether, having regard to all the circumstances, he will make representations to secure some reduction in the sentence.

MR. GLADSTONE: The ages of the offenders varied between seventeen to twenty-three; they were ordered to pay a fine of £2 each, or in default to go to prison for fourteen days; eight of them have paid their fines. The total amount of damage done on l'Ancresse Common on the night in question was very considerable, amounting, according to one estimate, to £100. Incendiary fires of this kind have increased in number recently in the island, and a large extent of grass on which the poorer inhabitants feed their sheep has been destroyed. I see no reason for advising any reduction in the penalties imposed.

Lead in Hollow Ware.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is his intention, before entirely prohibiting the practice of lining hollow ware with any percentage of lead included in the tinning process, at the same time to prohibit the importation of hollow ware the lining of which contains any percentage of lead.

MR. GLADSTONE: I understand the hon. Member to refer to the proposal in the draft regulations recently issued by me to prohibit the use of lead in the tinning of metal hollow ware. Careful inquiries were made before the draft was issued as to competition from foreign manufacturers, and though exact information was not obtainable, the result was to show that little or no ware of this kind tinned with lead is imported into this country. I would refer the hon. Member to page 14 of the Report on this subject which has been presented to Parliament, 1907–Cd. 3793.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: Cannot this trade claim the same assistance from the Home Secretary as the phosphorous match trade is getting in the Bill now under consideration?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am informed that there is practically no deleterious lead in this imported hollow ware. In the case of phosphorous matches there is grave danger to those employed in the manufacture.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): What foreign countries gave information freely on the question?

MR. GLADSTONE: Perhaps the hon. Member will consult the Report to which I have referred.

Linlithgow Miners' Disturbance.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department on what date the naturalisation papers of two Polish miners known as George M'Intosh and Charles Robertson, who were fined at the Linlithgow Sheriff Court for behaving in a disorderly manner at the house of a third Polish miner known as James Wilson were taken out.

MR. GLADSTONE: The names mentioned in the Question do not appear in the Register of Naturalised Aliens.

Deportation of Aliens.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the recent order for the deportation of an alien who was leaving his children behind in this country to be supported out of the rates; and whether he proposes to take any steps, by legislation or otherwise, to render possible the deportation of the alien with his wife and children to the country from which he came.

MR. GLADSTONE: I presume the hon. Member refers to the case of an alien named Schafer, as to which reports have recently appeared in the newspapers. If so, I think he is not in full possession of the facts. The alien's wife is dead, and I do not propose to take any steps with a view to expelling from the United Kingdom with this alien his two children who are British subjects, and who were the victims of the neglect and ill-treatment which led to his sentence of nine months imprisonment. Before, however, making an expulsion order against this man, I arranged with the director of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, who had prosecuted the man, that he would undertake the responsibility of making provision for the children; and I caused the Marylebone Board of Guardians, who had charge of the children during their father's imprisonment, to be informed of this. It is incorrect, therefore, to say that they are left to be supported out of the rates.

Chelmsford Election Disturbances

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) asked the Home Secretary whether his attention had been called to the proceedings at Ingatestone last night, when the doors of the hall in which a meeting was about to be held were broken open, the two agents in charge of the meeting assaulted, thrown down, trampled upon, dragged out with ropes, and one of them, Mr. James Martin, seriously injured; that three policemen of the Essex constabulary were present the whole time, but did not interfere, and did not arrest any of the rioters; whether the Home Secretary would at once inquire of the chief constable of Essex what police assistance he requires from London or elsewhere in maintaining order in his district.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham) asked the Home Secretary whether he did not say in reply to a Question in reference to riotous conduct in the Mid-Devon election that it was impossible for the Home Secretary to interfere with the jurisdiction of the local constabulary.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question of the noble Lord, will he state whether the police decided that these rioters at Ingatestone were young men of the loafing class or "gentlemen of high spirit and culture"?

MR. GLADSTONE: In answer to the noble Lord, I am not at present aware that there is any parallel between the case of Newton Abbot and the case of Ingatestone. As regards the Question of my hon. friend, I am only cognisant of the facts as stated in the newspapers, but of course I will at once make inquiries.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that all who sat on the Opposition benches in that House deeply deplored the occurrences referred to, and the fact that a few persons had been guilty of so flagrant a breach of decency and good order? They all regretted the examples which had been set in other elections in other parts of England.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he quite accepted what had fallen from his hon. friend opposite. So far as he was concerned, he deplored and condemned all these violent exhibitions of party feeling.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) inquired if the Home Secretary's attention had been called to the fact that these gentlemen had been carted about from one part of the constituency to another, and could he say at whose expense the carting was being done?

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman tell me what the English papers would have said if this had happened in Ireland?

MR. CORRIE GRANT said he had just received a telephone message from the son of the injured man, Mr. Martin, announcing that the very grave apprehensions formed last night as to Mr. Martin's state had been removed, and that he had improved.

Copinshay (Orkney)—Lighthouse required.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if, in view of the fact that a lighthouse and fog-signal at Copinshay, Orkney, has long been urged by the Northern Lights Commissioners, and that the light is urgently demanded, not only by reason of the extent of shipping but by the heavy tides prevailing, he will now give the consent of the Board of Trade to its construction.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir H. KEARLEY, Devonport): Proposals for a lighthouse and fog-signal at Copinshay were made by the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses in their estimates for 1907–8 and 1908–9, but the Board of Trade, after consultation with the Advisory Committee on New Lighthouse Works, considered that these works were less urgent than others proposed by the Commissioners. The proposal appears again in the estimates for the next financial year, and will be carefully considered.

Railway Working Agreements.

MR WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has had a copy of the agreement between the Great Northern and Great Central Railway Companies; if so, will he lay the same upon the Table of the House; and, if he has not had a copy of such agreement, will he endeavour to obtain the same and lay it upon the Table of the House.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has had a copy of the agreement between the North British and the Caledonian Railway Companies; and, if so, will he lay the same upon the Table of the House; and, if he has not had a copy of such agreement, will he endeavour to obtain the same and lay it upon the Table of the House.

I beg further to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has had a copy of the agreement between the London and North Western and Midland Railway Companies; if so, will he lay the same upon the Table of the House; and, if he has not had a copy of such agreement, will he endeavour to obtain the same and lay it upon the Table of the House.

SIR H. KEARLEY: I understand that no formal agreement has been entered into by the Great Northern and Great Central Companies alone, but as I informed the hon. Member on the 17th inst., an agreement between these two companies and the Great Eastern Railway Company is to be submitted to Parliament in the form of a Bill. As regards the agreements between the other railway companies referred to I should explain that the companies concerned are not under any obligation to deposit copies of such agreements at the Board of Trade. I may take this opportunity of adding that the whole subject of railway agreements of the class to which these Questions relate and of their relation to the general interests of the public is receiving the most careful examination at the Board of Trade and that my right hon. friend proposes to make a statement with regard thereto early in next session.

MR. WARDLE: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that, although a Bill is to be brought in next session, the Great Northern and Great Central are working in agreement at the present moment?

SIR H. KEARLEY: The whole thing is receiving the most careful attention at the hands of my right hon. friend, and I cannot say more at the moment than that he will make a statement as to the whole of these agreements at the beginning of next session.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Meanwhile will the Board of Trade refuse to sanction any agreement?

SIR H. KEARLEY: The Board of Trade have no power to forbid agreements which do not come under the provisions of the Railway Clauses Act, 1863.

*MR. REES inquired whether, when this matter was under consideration, the interests of stockholders also would be taken into account.

SIR H. KEARLEY said that was not a question which arose out of his reply, but no doubt all the interests concerned would be considered.

MR. WARDLE: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that a Select Committee sat on this subject in 1872 and distinctly stated that these agreements were illegal?

SIR H. KEARLEY: I have no doubt that is so.

Railway and Canal Commission.

MR. WARDLE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what has been the cost of the Railway and Canal Commission during the last ten years; how many cases have been brought before the Commission; how many of those cases have been decided in favour of the applicants, how many in favour of the defendants, and how many are still unsettled; on how many days in each of the ten years the Commission sat; and the average cost of each case decided by the Commission.

SIR H. KEARLEY: The expenditure of the Railway and Canal Commission during the ten years ended March 31st last amounted to nearly £63,000, and I am sending the hon. Member the figures for each of the years in question. The Court sat on forty-three days in 1907. The number of its sittings in each of the ten previous years together with particulars of the applications dealt with, etc., will be found on page 36 of the Judicial Statistics for England and Wales for 1906 which is in the Library.

Unemployment Statistics.

EARL WINTERTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the precise difficulties which his Department has met with in attempting to obtain accurate comparable statistics of trade union unemployment in this country and in Germany.

SIR. H. KEARLEY: I would refer the noble Lord to Appendix IX. (pp. 521–4) of the Report on "Cost of Living in German Towns" [Cd. 4032] issued by the Board of Trade last April in which the difficulties are set out in detail.

EARL WINTERTON: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that his right hon. colleague some time ago said he was endeavouring to obtain a more accurate comparison of the amount of unemployment and would make a further statement? I want to know what special difficulties he has met with.

SIR H. KEARLEY: They are set out in detail in the paper I have referred to.

EARL WINTERTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can, from information in the possession of his Department, state if the difference in the method of obtaining statistics relating to trade union unemployment in this country and in Germany is so great as to render the statistics given in the Board of Trade Labour Gazette of unemployment in September 1908 in the two countries valueless for the purposes of comparison.

SIR H. KEARLEY: The difficulties referred to in my Answer to the previous Question (which are not solely or mainly due to differences in the method of obtaining the statistics) are in the judgment of the Board of Trade so great as to render any useful comparison between the two sets of figures impossible.

EARL WINTERTON: Then are we to understand that in 1908 the percentage of unemployment in Germany was 2·4, while in England it was 6 or 7. Are we to accept that as the effect of his Answer?

SIR H. KEARLEY'S reply was inaudible.

Imports of Roofing Slates.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what quantity of roofing slates were imported into the United Kingdom during the year ending 31st December, 1907, from the United States and Newfoundland respectively.

SIR H. KEARLEY: The imports of roofing slates into the United Kingdom in 1907 which were consigned from the United States amounted to 4,085 tons. No roofing slates were consigned to the United Kingdom in that year from Newfoundland.

Women Teachers.

MR. CROOKS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he can inform the House how many women teachers are teachers who hold certificates, and how many teachers who do not hold certificates, and the present number of women teachers holding certificates in England who are out of employment; and whether schools could be found for them if the classes were brought down to reasonable proportions of say forty.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): On the last day of the school year 1906–07, there were 58,845 women certificated teachers employed in public elementary schools, and 57,276 women teachers who were not certificated. I have no statistics as to the number who are out of employment.

Irish Teachers.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education why it is that Irish teachers, having been trained for the prescribed two years course in a Dublin training college, and passed the revised examination, and received their Irish diploma, are recognised by the Board of Education in England simply as uncertificated teachers, and only receive the salary of untrained teachers, with no hope of future promotion, although no adverse report would have been received from the Irish Commissioners, while the training and examination for Irish teachers is the more difficult of the two, having a similar examination, but with additional subjects; and if the Code makes no distinction between trained and untrained teachers, how is it that a trained teacher receives £90 a year on leaving college, while the untrained teacher starts with £75 a year; and, if they are classed alike, why does this difference of £15 per year exist.

MR. TREVELYAN: The hon. Member appears to be under a misapprehension. Teachers who have passed the revised examination after a course of training in an Irish training college, and have received a diploma from the Irish Commissioners of National Education are qualified for recognition as certificated teachers. The present Code makes no distinction between trained and untrained teachers, and no occasion has, therefore, arisen for the Board of Education to decide in which category these teachers should be placed, but I must not be taken as admitting the accuracy of the hon. Member's statement that the course of training and examination in Irish training colleges is more exacting than in English colleges. A teacher's salary is determined by the local education authority by whom he is employed, and is not subject to control by the Board of Education.

MR. NANNETTI asked if certificated Irish teachers were not paid lower salaries than their English colleagues?

MR. TREVELYAN: I am not aware of that, but will inquire into any facts laid before me.

Systematic Moral Instruction.

MR. G. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, if the Education Bill becomes law, the local education authorities which now give systematic moral instruction during the time ordinarily set apart for religious instruction will be able to continue to give such teaching at the same hour as at present.

MR. TREVELYAN: There is nothing in Clause 1 (2) (b) to prevent the giving of systematic moral instruction during the time referred to.

Denominational Definitions.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what is meant by any specified religious denomination in clause 1 (2) (a) of the new Education Bill; and whether he will give a list of such denominations.

MR. TREVELYAN: The words in the clause are intended to mean precisely what they say. A list of the various denominations in this country is to be found in many books of reference.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL: In consequence of the hon. Member's answer, I shall call attention to this matter at the Committee stage, if closure permits.

Plant of Contracting-out Schools.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if the furniture, plant, and equipment placed in existing non-provided schools since 1902 will be surrendered to the local education authority in the event of such schools contracting out of the new Act.

Mr. TREVELYAN: The law as to the ownership of school furniture in contracted-out schools is not in any way altered by the Bill.

Boy Clerkships.

Sir G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that numerous intending candidates for boy clerkships who have been studying for examination under the present regulations and who are over sixteen years of age would be precluded by the new regulations from going in for examination, he can arrange that one more examination shall be held to which candidates up to seventeen years of age will be admitted.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): It was announced in July that the competition for boy clerkships held last September would be the last held under the old regulations. Boys who have passed the new age limit of sixteen are eligible to compete for the second division and all the subjects prescribed for the examination for boy clerkships find a place in the scheme of examination for the second division. I am informed that it is undesirable to delay the introduction of the new scheme and impracticable to combine the proposed higher limit of entry with the reduce period of service.

Government Blotting Paper Contracts.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether Messrs. Huber Brothers, writing on 13th March, 1906, offered to supply the Government with any sort of blotting paper at a price just below the cost of production, and much under the price the Government were then paying; whether the Government refused and gave as an answer a reference to a former answer on 20th March, 1905, to the effect that blotting papers were obtained from mills in the United Kingdom, and that, therefore, Huber Brothers were not eligible to tender; and whether the Government will apply the same principle of British work for British workers to all Government requirements, so as to provide work and wages for the unemployed.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I understand the facts of this case to be as follows:—On 13th March, 1906, Messrs. Huber Brothers wrote repeating former offers to supply the Stationery Office with their make of blotting paper. They declared their readiness to do so at a price which, they stated, represented a slight loss on the cost of production, and which would be less than the Department was paying for blotting paper stated by Messrs. Huber to be not so absorbent, not so strong, and not so lasting as theirs. The paper of Messrs. Huber had been previously thoroughly tested, and it was found that, as compared with the blotting papers which the Department was purchasing, it was no more absorbent, that it was inferior as regards the quality of material, and that it cost two and a half times as much. It was, moreover, of foreign manufacture, and as all ordinary papers for the use of Government Departments are purchased direct from mills in the United Kingdom, (*see* Cd. 2083 of 1904 p. 23), they were so informed and told that their firm was thus not eligible to tender for such supplies. I am unable to give the pledge asked for in the last paragraph.

Mr. HUNT asked if Messrs. Huber Brothers did not offer to supply blotting paper of any specification but were refused permission to quote simply because the blotting paper was not made in England.

Mr. HODGE (Lancashire, Gorton): Is the hon. Gentleman aware of a new blotting paper made in Shropshire and named Boadicea?

Mr. HOBHOUSE replied that he could not go into details without notice.

Meat Supplies and Prices.

Mr. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, owing to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States of America, which will doubtless decrease the meat supply of this country, so largely dependent upon America, he will withdraw the Order preventing Norway and Sweden from exporting live cattle for slaughter into this country.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir E. STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The action taken by the Board under the Diseases of Animals Acts must be governed by considerations of the risk of the introduction of disease into this country, and the Board are not prepared in the present circumstances to adopt my hon. friend's suggestion. I may add that the live imports from the United States represent altogether less than 5 per cent. of our total meat supply (home and foreign).

MR. B. S. STRAUS: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that if something is not done, owing to the control that the Americans have over the meat supply of this country, it will mean a very serious increase in the price of meat to the poor people of London at Christmas time?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I am aware that the *Daily Mail* on Monday said there would be an increase, but I am also aware that the *Westminster Gazette* says meat is likely to be even cheaper than usual this Christmas.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the *Westminster Gazette* a Government organ?

MR. B. S. STRAUS: It is not a question of what the newspapers say. If foot-and-mouth disease has broken out, will it not mean a very serious increase in the price?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I am quite aware of that, and my hon. friend should not, therefore, rely upon newspapers for the foundation of his Questions on this matter.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) asked whether it was not a fact that the public, and especially the poorer classes, were much better served by the supply of dead meat, which was not subject to restrictions of this kind, and attending the importation of which there was no risk of disease.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he would not commit himself to the opinion that the public was better served, but the greater quantity of imported meat was dead meat, and not live meat.

Small Holdings in Hampshire.

MR. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he has information showing that the Hampshire County Council intend shortly to acquire 234 acres for small holdings, whereas the area applied for is 7,584 acres; and whether the Board, as the constituted judges in the matter, propose to make any representations to the council as to the advisability of their making greater use of their statutory powers.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are informed that the county council are negotiating for other lands in addition to the 234 acres mentioned. We are in constant communication with the county council and representations were made by the Commissioner last August, urging the county council to use their compulsory powers wherever there was no immediate prospect of obtaining land by agreement.

MR. R. HARCOURT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that in Hampshire, 499 applications have been made for 7,584 acres, out of which 168 applications have been refused as unsuitable and 226 applications for 2,354 acres provisionally approved; and will he say whether the decision as to suitability rests in the discretion of the county council; and, if not, whether the Commissioners or the Board propose to keep a central register of applications and to notify the unsuccessful applicants (who in this single case have asked for over 5,000 acres) that they have a power of appeal.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The figures given are approximately correct. The decision as to whether applicants are suitable or not rests in the first instance with the county council, but any applicant who is dissatisfied can write to the Board, who inquire into every such complaint. The Board do not think it necessary to keep a central register of applications.

MR. R. HARCOURT: May I ask my hon. friend if his attention has been called to a recent discussion in the Hants

County Council, when the Earl of Northbrook said that the council had "built slowly, carefully, deliberately and with circumspection" and whether the Board do not think that the carefulness and circumspection are being a little overdone?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It all depends on the degree of slowness.

Small Holdings Commissioners.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he can state the number of Land Commissioners employed under the Small Holdings Act; what is their salary; how often do they report; what are the hours they are expected to give to their department; and how many days per week are they so engaged.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Two Commissioners are employed at a salary of £1,200 per annum. They report daily and are subject to the Rules and Regulations of the Civil Service.

Board of Agriculture.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he can state the number of persons who comprise this Board and their names, how often do they meet, the dates upon which they have met during this year, and the place of meeting; whether he can state the average number of hours per meeting the Board is occupied with the deliberations of its Department; and how many of the members of the Board are Members of this House.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board consists of eleven members, namely: a President, the President of the Council, the principal Secretaries of State, the First Lord of the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and the Secretary for Scotland. Six are Members of this House. There is no record of the Board, as such, having ever met.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: What salaries do these gentlemen get?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The salaries attaching to their respective offices.

Administration of the Small Holdings Act.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that certain county councils are providing the names of applicants for small holdings to landowners; and whether, in view of the unsatisfactory position of small holders in Ireland and Wales holding under private landowners without security of tenure, he will point out to the councils that the requirements of the applicants should be supplied by the councils direct, so as to secure them the benefits provided by the Act.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board have already informed certain county councils that the names of applicants should not be furnished to private landowners without their consent, and we have reason to suppose that in those cases the practice has been discontinued. If an applicant desires to hold direct from the county council it is the duty of the county council to meet his wishes in this respect provided he would be a suitable tenant of a small holding.

Mayo Cattle-drives.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Saturday night, the 7th November last, an extensive cattle-drive took place at Towerhill and at a place called Waterford, in County Mayo; whether he can state if all the stock has been recovered by the police stationed at Hollymount and Ballyglass; how many arrests have been made; and what sentences have been passed on the perpetrators of the outrages.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): This appears to be the case referred to in the Question asked by the hon. and gallant Member on the 17th inst. I have nothing to add to my reply to that Question.

Riverstown Disturbances—Death of John Stenson.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the inquest held on John Stenson no evidence but that tendered by the police would be received by the coroner, and that the coroner assigned as his reason for refusing to receive evidence tendered by civilians that a magisterial investigation into the death of John Stenson would subsequently be held; what authority had the coroner for making that statement, and for refusing to hear the evidence of civilians; is he aware that persons who were in company with Stenson when he was shot are prepared to give evidence; that the refusal of the Irish Government to hold a public sworn inquiry gives colour to the belief prevalent in the locality to the effect that the police had received instructions to fire on the people; and will he see that the inquiry asked for will be held without further delay.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the fact that the county council of Sligo, as well as all the other representative public bodies of the county, have passed resolutions, unanimously adopted in each case, calling for a public sworn inquiry into the circumstance surrounding the death of John Stenson, which took place at Riverstown, County Sligo, on the 29th October last; whether he is aware that a similar resolution, in connection with this case, was adopted by seven magistrates assembled at the Riverstown Petty Sessions Court, on the 5th inst.; and whether, seeing that the opinion prevailing amonst all classes in the neighbourhood of Riverstown is that an inquiry should be held, he will consider the advisability of holding such inquiry on an early date.

MR. BIRRELL: The allegations contained in the first Question as to what took place at the coroner's inquest are new to me, and I have had no opportunity of investigating them. For my own information I will send some one in whose judgment I have confidence to make inquiries with regard to these statements, and to let me know the result. As to holding the inquiry referred to in the Questions, I have nothing to add to my Answers given both to the hon. Member himself and to the hon. Member for Mid-Armagh on the 5th inst.

State Purchase of Irish Railways.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Gerald Balfour, when he was Chief Secretary for Ireland, obtained by request from Mr. Thomas Robertson, the then chairman of the Irish Board of Works, two estimates relating to State purchase of the railways of Ireland; whether one was for total purchase and the other for the cost of guaranteeing dividends to the shareholders, under an arrangement securing to the Government complete control and working of the systems; whether he has any objection to produce those documents for the information of the House; and will he submit them to the Royal Commission on Irish Railways now sitting for their consideration and report.

MR. BIRRELL: I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for South Roscommon on the 10th June, 1907.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with Mr. Gerald Balfour and ask him if he had such a report at the Irish Office, and what has come of it?

MR. BIRRELL: I will make further inquiry.

United Irish League.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain from the constabulary authorities the number of branches of the United Irish League in the counties of Leitrim, Longford, Galway, Roscommon, Clare, and Westmeath, respectively, and the proportion of those that have been active, during the past twelve months, in passing intimidatory and boycotting resolutions which were subsequently published in the local newspapers.

MR. BIRRELL: I do not propose to make the inquiries suggested by the hon. Member.

*Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Why does the right hon. Gentleman refuse the information in this case? He has already supplied it with reference to another county.

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not think it is any part of the business of the police to make exhaustive inquiries all over Ireland as to the nature of associations of this kind.

*Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Is it not the fact that these United Irish League branches are the centres from which nearly all the disturbances arise, and is not that therefore a reason for procuring the information?

[No Answer was returned.]

Threatening Notice to a Galway Magistrate.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any official information showing that one magistrate at least of County Galway has received a notice threatening him with the same death that befell his father if he attended Loughrea Petty Sessions; and, if so, will he explain the statement that there was no such case during the past two years.

Mr. BIRRELL: It is the fact that a letter was received in July 1907 by a Galway magistrate warning him not to attend Loughrea Petty Sessions. The letter did not contain an actual threat of the kind mentioned in the Question, but it was no doubt intended to intimidate. The letter was unfortunately overlooked when the police records were being searched for the purpose of replying to the Question asked by the hon. Member on the 12th instant.

Riverstown United Irish League.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the proceedings on the adjourned hearing at Ballymote Petty Sessions, on the 12th instant, of summonses charging twenty-one members and officers of the United Irish League with intimidation designed to compel Protestant farmers of the Riverstown district to become members of the League, and to subscribe to its funds; and whether, in view of the decision arrived at by a majority of the justices again to adjourn the cases until February next without hearing any evidence for the prosecution, it is the intention of the Crown to make immediate application to the King's Bench Division of the High Court for a writ of mandamus compelling the justices to hear and determine the cases.

Mr. BIRRELL: This matter is at present under the consideration of the Law Officers of the Crown, and it would not be in accordance with the public interest to make any statement upon the subject.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: How long does the right hon. Gentleman expect the Law Officers of the Crown to take to make up their minds on a point on which any ordinary person could make up his mind in ten minutes?

Mr. BIRRELL: The Government have to put up with the Law Officers they have at present.

Cost of Teaching Irish in Irish Schools.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the total expenditure, actual and pending, from Imperial funds incurred by the payment of fees for the teaching of Irish as an extra subject in national schools during the past school year; what was the additional administrative expenditure incurred during the same period by reason of the liability for payment of such fees; whether the Government, in prescribing existing scale of fees, took the precaution of imposing any limitation on the maximum amount of expenditure that may be incurred from Imperial funds for this service; and, if not, will he ask the Commissioners of National Education to furnish an estimate of the expenditure that may ultimately be reached on the basis of the fees now paid.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education estimate that the total expenditure on the teaching of Irish as an extra subject during the past school year, along with the fees for bilingual schools, will amount to slightly less than £15,000. The additional administrative expenditure was trifling, but the staff of organisers and inspectors employed in consequence of the increase of instruction in Irish cost about £2,500. The fees are paid according to a fixed scale, and the regulations governing the allocation of the grants are very stringent.

Price of Land in County Clare.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the average number of years purchase paid for land in County Clare under the Act of 1903.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the purchase money of holdings in County Clare in respect of which purchase agreements have been lodged under the Irish Land Act, 1903, represents an average of 20·7 years purchase of the rental.

Boxwell Evicted Tenants.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Boxwell evicted tenants have been out of their homes for over twenty years, and that on the 23rd of July last, the Estates Commissioners furnished the owner with the estimate of the price which they are prepared to offer for the estate; will he say whether the owner has accepted the offer of the Estates Commissioners; and, if not, will they consider the advisability of taking up the estate compulsorily and selling it to the tenants.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that in this case the owner has refused to sell at the price estimated by them, and that on the 20th November they published in the *Dublin Gazette* a notice of their intention to acquire the lands compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act.

Mr. FFRENCH: I hope the tenants will get back in time to sow the spring crops.

Mr. BIRRELL: I should be sorry to express an opinion. We will do our best.

Police Action Against Cattle-Drivers.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any special instructions have been issued authorising the police in certain cases of cattle-driving to arrest the offenders and bring them before a single resident magistrate out of petty sessions, with a view to their being bound over to future good behaviour under the statute of Edward III.; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of these instructions.

Mr. BIRRELL: I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Attorney-General to a similiar Question asked by him on the 11th instant. Any instructions issued to the police are of a confidential nature, and it would be contrary to public policy to lay them on the Table.

Boycotted Protestants at Riverstown.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the authorities first became aware that persons were being boycotted in the Riverstown district for refusing to subscribe to the funds of the United Irish League, what action was taken; and at what date did the authorities move in the matter.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the cases of the Protestants in the Riverstown district who have been boycotted for some months past were included in the statistics of boycotting recently given; and, if so, whether these cases were classified as serious or minor boycotting; and what was the total number of persons comprised in the cases so recorded.

Mr. BIRRELL: As a prosecution is pending in this case, it is not desirable to make any statement on the subject.

Failure to Report Irish Outrages.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state what are the reasons assigned by the Inspector-General and the local police for the failure of individuals who have been the object of serious outrages, affecting either their person or their property, to report such outrages promptly to the police.

MR. BIRRELL: It would be utterly impossible to give the reason for withholding information in each individual case. Reports made to the Government by the police authorities must be regarded as strictly confidential.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that we might put a great many Questions about police court cases in Ulster constituencies, but we do not believe in defiling our own nest?

MR. BIRRELL: There are quite enough Questions put to me as it is.

Cappamore (Limerick) Untenanted Lands.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that arrangements for sale and purchase have been concluded between Mrs. Lloyd, of Portnard, Cappamore, County Limerick, and her tenants; and will he recommend the Estates Commissioners to take measures for obtaining a few hundred acres of untenanted land outlying the demesne, from which about sixty years ago several families were evicted, in the interests of poor tenants and the people of the town of Cappamore and surrounding districts, to be apportioned among them, with the turbary attached to same.

MR. BIRRELL: The purchase agreements in respect of this estate were only lodged on 10th October. When the Estates Commissioners are dealing with the estate in its order of priority they will make inquiry as regards the untenanted land referred to.

Labourers' Cottages in County Clare.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say how many labourers' cottages have been erected in County Clare under all the Acts, and stating the number in each union.

MR. BIRRELL: For the number of cottages erected in each rural district up to 31st March last, amounting in all to 518, I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to a Question asked by him on 14th July last. The Local Government Board cannot say how many cottages have since been erected, but the additional number authorised was 714, distributed as follows:—Ballyvaughan, eighty-one; Corrofin, forty; Ennis, 125; Ennistymon, sixty-eight; Killadysert, forty-six; Kilrush, 125; Limerick (No. 2), fifty-six; Scariff, sixty-four; and Tulla, 109, making a grand total of 1,232 cottages built or authorised in Clare alone.

Crime in County Clare.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of specially-reported cases in the county of Clare for the ten months ending 31st October, 1908 and also for the year 1907.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that the number of offences specially reported in County Clare during the year 1907 was 149, and during the ten months ending 31st October last, 229.

Holycross (Tipperary) Disturbances.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of the attack made upon the police at Holycross, County Tipperary, on Monday; how many policemen were injured; and how many persons were arrested.

MR. BIRRELL: A district inspector and two constables were seriously injured on this occasion. The county inspector and some other constables were also struck with stones. Nineteen persons have been arrested and remanded. As proceedings are pending it is not desirable to make any further statement.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the sole cause of this trouble is the fact that while the landlord agreed to sell land from which some seventy-two tenants had been evicted, the Estate Commissioners refused to take action?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot go into that, but I cannot help thinking this landlord is a very much injured man.

Gortdromerillagh Outrage.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of a moonlighting outrage at Gortdromerillagh, near Firies, in the early morning of Thursday, 19th November, and an attack by masked men upon men proceeding to a certain quarry for lime on Friday; and whether any arrests have been made.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that at 1.30 a.m. on the date in question one or two men visited the house of Patrick Sullivan at Gortdromerillagh, smashed the window and fired some revolver shots outside the house, and warned Sullivan not to work any more at Firies Quarry. The following morning about 6 a.m. two men, who were driving to the same quarry for lime, were stopped by some men who ordered them to turn back, and fired two shots. It was dark on both occasions, and the men who fired the shots were not identified. The police have not therefore been able to make any arrests.

The Mount St. Vincent Orphanage.

MR. MACCAW (Down, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the circumstances attending the death of nine inmates of The Mount St. Vincent Orphanage, at Limerick, and the illness of forty-four others, as the result of eating meat which had been kept five days in the institution before being cooked; whether this orphanage receives any grant from public funds; whether it is inspected on behalf of any public authority; and whether it is intended to take any action with a view to safeguard the health and lives of the inmates of this and similar institutions.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention has been called to this case. The institution is an industrial school and as such receives a capitation grant from the State and is subject to Government inspection. It also receives contributions from county and borough funds. It has always been regarded as one of the best female industrial schools in Ireland. This unfortunate occurrence was a misadventure which might have happened any where and is deeply regretted by the managers of the school.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): Did not the medical gentleman who gave evidence at the inquest pay a high tribute to the manner in which this school is conducted?

MR. BIRRELL: No doubt.

MR. JOYCE: Why do hon. Members bring up such questions unless they wish to disparage the school?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it in consonance with the practice of this House to make a great public calamity the vehicle for personal political attack?

*MR. SPEAKER: I deprecate it, but it has often occurred before.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Not on our side. It is a question of taste.

Work of the Estates Commissioners.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that dissatisfaction exists in Ireland among vendors of land and their tenants at the methods by which certain estates in the books of the Estates Commissioners appear to have gained an undue priority over others originally earlier in point of time; and if he will grant the Return to be moved for by the hon. Member for North Armagh.

MR. BIRRELL: I am not aware of any ground for the suggestion that certain estates on the books of the Estates Commissioners have received undue priority, and I am not prepared to grant the Return asked for by the hon. Member.

MR. CULLINAN: Has not the hon. Member for North Armagh been asking thirty-one years purchase for his land?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot say.

County Westmeath Police.

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the free apportionment of police for the county Westmeath, prior to fixing same at 190 men in May, 1906; what was the basis on which the reduction was made, and why the original free allotment should not be restored when more men were required; where the extra police at present in the county Westmeath were drafted from; if from the number allotted free to other counties, will he explain why they are not to be credited with cost of same; and if they have been drawn from the reserve at Dublin, why are they not paid from Imperial funds, as they would be if retained in Dublin.

MR. BIRRELL: The free quota of police for the county of Westmeath was 235 men for the three years prior to May, 1906, when it was fixed at 190, under the authority of Section 1 of the Act, 48 Vic. cap. 12. No change in the free quota can be made until the end of the period of three years fixed by the Act. When the county was proclaimed under the Constabulary (Ireland) Act, 1836, detachments were serving in it drawn from the following counties: Cork fifteen, Kilkenny two, Mayo twelve, Waterford five, Wexford eight, Wicklow three. These detachments became by virtue of the proclamation and warrant an additional establishment under the Act, and ceased to belong to the counties from which they had been drawn. Steps were then taken to fill up the vacancies thus created in the counties named. As counties are not required to pay any part of the cost of their normal police force they are not entitled to any credit or payment in respect of men temporarily absent.

Kilbeggan Cattle Drive.

SIR WALTER NUGENT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the recent prosecution for alleged cattle-driving in Kilbeggan, County Westmeath; if he has any official information showing that the defendants thought they were carrying out a contract with the owner of the land, and not violating the law, is he aware that the evidence of the parish priest and the late occupier bears out this contention, and that it was admitted, during the hearing of the case, that the herds employed to look after the land assisted in removing the cattle; and whether in view of these facts, he will endeavour to get the alternative sentence of three months imprisonment passed on the defendants mitigated.

MR. BIRRELL: I have no power to interfere with the decision of the magistrates in this case, nor would it be proper for me to discuss the evidence on which they acted.

Kildorrery Labourer's Cottage.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain from the Labour Department of the Local Government Board the grounds upon which the claim of John McGrath for a labourer's cottage and acre plot on the farm of eighty acres occupied by Mr. John Therry, J.P., Springvale, Kildorrery, County Cork, has been rejected, seeing that the house occupied by John McGrath and his family of ten was condemned as unfit for human habitation by Dr. Browne, Local Government Board inspector, and by Dr. Buckley, district medical officer, and that the application of John McGrath was sanctioned by an inspector of the Local Government Board at an inquiry held at Mitchelstown last March; and whether he will take any action in the the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have no information as to the grounds of the County Court Judge's decision in this case. That decision is final.

Irish Land Bill.

MR. MACCAW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the Second Reading of the Irish Land Bill is likely to be taken.

MR. BIRRELL: I am in communication with the Prime Minister on this subject.

Unemployment in Limerick.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a Distress Committee for the relief of the unemployed has been set up in Limerick; if so, what steps have been taken with a view to secure a grant; and whether any such grant has been made, and, if so, what is the amount.

MR. BIRRELL: An order has been issued by the Local Government Board enabling the corporation of Limerick to constitute a Distress Committee under the Unemployed Workmen Act. When the Committee is formed it will be open to it to apply for a grant from the unemployed fund, and the application when made will receive due consideration.

Ballyfarnon Cattle-Drive.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to an outrage which occurred last week near Ballyfarnon, County Roscommon, the residence of Miss Frazer, when three valuable cattle were driven off the farm and, after having had their tails cut off, were driven into a swamp and drowned; and what steps have been taken to bring the offenders to justice.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that on the night of the 11th instant four bullocks, the property of the Misses Frazer, were driven off their land and forced into a bog hole. The cattle were not drowned, nor were their tails cut. The police, with the assistance of some civilians, got them out of the bog. A claim for compensation has been lodged.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Mr. Speaker, is it not a rule of this House that any hon. Member putting down a Question should make himself responsible for the truth of the statements contained in it, and does not censure attach to the hon. Member for the City of London for putting a Question containing two absolutely false statements?

*MR. SPEAKER: The rule is that any Member who asks a Question makes himself responsible for the statements contained therein, but it sometimes happens that these statements turn out to be inaccurate.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Is not an expression of apology due from the hon. Gentleman?

*MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid a great deal of time would be occupied in this way.

Irish Extra Police Charges.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how the charge of £43 6s. 0d. per annum for each extra head constable and £34 9s. 3d. per annum for each extra sergeant or constable made against Irish county councils is arrived at; and what are the items that make up the charge.

MR. BIRRELL: The charges in question represent a moiety of the cost of the extra force arrived at in the manner prescribed by the Constabulary (Ireland) Act, 1874. The rate of charge for a head constable is fixed by the Act, while that for sergeants and constables is based upon an average of the cost of the entire constabulary force in Ireland, regard being had to the rate of pay sanctioned by the Act, and to the cost of clothing, medical attendance, barrack accommodation, local travelling expenses, and subsistence allowance.

Galway Extra Police.

MR. HAZLETON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many of the 346 extra police drafted into county Galway have been withdrawn, and whether he can state the intention of the Irish Government with regard to those that still remain.

MR. BIRRELL: None of the extra police sent to county Galway have been withdrawn, and the reasons for sending them there still continue.

Mr. Frank North's Kerry Estate.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the estate of M. H. Franks in North Kerry has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners, and, if so, has it been bought by the Estates Commissioners, and when; and, if bought, whether the agent to the landlord has any power or authority at present to take proceedings for arrears of rent due on the estate.

MR. BIRRELL: The estate in question has been offered to the Estates Commissioners, but they are not yet in a position to make an offer for its purchase.

MR. FLAVIN: Was not this estate offered to the Commissioners eighteen months ago, and are negotiations still proceeding?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know. I will inquire.

Killarney Fair Rent Appeals.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the decisions on the fair rent appeals heard before the Chief Land Commission at their last sitting in Killarney will be delivered.

MR. BIRRELL: It is expected that judgments will be given shortly in these cases.

MR. FLAVIN: Were not these decisions to have been given a month ago?

MR. BIRRELL: No doubt there has been delay. I will press the matter forward if I can.

King-Harman Estate Tenantry.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the month of July, 1905, agreements were entered into by the tenants of the King-Harman estate living in the parish of Ballinamuck to purchase their holdings at terms fixed by the Master of the Rolls, which included a handing over of the bogs for the benefit of the tenants; whether for the past three years no interest in lieu of rent was called for in respect of this property; whether he is aware that by notice dated 10th November, 1908, the tenants have been called upon to pay up their old rents at Longford on 2nd December; whether he is aware that this break up of the sale will mean ruin to the 100 families on this property; and whether, in the interest of peace in the district, he will ask the Estates Commissioners to arrange to take over this property at once on the terms sanctioned by the Master of the Rolls.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the agreements referred to appear to have been provisional agreements indicating the price at which the tenants would be prepared to purchase, in the event of proceedings being instituted for the sale of the property to the Commissioners. An originating request for such a sale has now been lodged and will be dealt with by the Commissioners as soon as possible, with the view of making an offer under Section 6 of the Act of 1903. Until the offer has been made and accepted, and until undertakings to purchase have been obtained from the tenants, the latter continue to be liable for rent. The Commissioners have no knowledge of any proceedings which the receiver may have been directed to take for the collection of rents now due.

Public Accounts Committee.

EARL WINTERTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is yet in a position to state if it will be possible to grant a day for discussing the Report of the Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir; I am not in a position to make a statement on this matter.

EARL WINTERTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman not consider if it is possible before the end of the session to give even a part of a sitting for this purpose?

MR. ASQUITH: I have already expressed my desire to do it, but I have found it impossible.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

MR. GLOVER (St. Helens): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can state the day the Report stage of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill will be taken.

MR. ASQUITH: I hope that the Report stage will be taken the week after next.

Parliament and the Ratification of Treaties.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in the light of recent circumstances, he will consider the advisability of making provision in some form that the assent of Parliament should be required to be given to the making of treaties by Great Britain with foreign Powers before the actual ratification of such treaties, with a view to the conferring on Parliament of a more direct control than it at present possesses over questions of foreign policy, having regard to the fact that Parliament is not consulted even as to the essence of a treaty.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not prepared to give any positive assurance that no treaty concluded by His Majesty's Government will be ratified until Parliament has been consulted and its approval obtained. Such a course would involve a material change in the constitutional usage hitherto followed in this country, and could obviously only be adopted in pursuance of a formal debate and after mature consideration. Nor does it appear to me that any such alteration of procedure is really required, as it will usually happen that an opportunity for debate will be found in the considerable interval that generally takes place between the signature of a treaty and its ratification, and no diplomatic document would be ratified against the declared wishes of this House.

Mr. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): Is there any rule governing the class of treaties which do or do not demand the assent of Parliament?

Mr. ASQUITH: I ought to have notice of that, but I can say at once that if a treaty involves any alteration of statute law, of course the assent of Parliament is needed.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the Prime Minister aware that a Motion in this House was all but carried in 1886, approving that treaties in some form should be submitted to this House before being ratified; and is he aware that only one week after Parliament was adjourned we heard for the first time of the promulgation and ratification of an important treaty—the Anglo-Russian Treaty?

Mr. ASQUITH: There is a great difference between a thing being carried and all but carried, and I do not quite know what importance my hon. friend attaches to the difference. I will look into the historical side of the matter.

Pension Regulations.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it was his intention when moving the Old-Age Pensions Bill to exclude from its provisions those persons who were costing the guardians nothing, only the cost of collection or distribution of moneys paid them for the dependants of certain persons, and whether he will take any action whereby the pension committees shall be empowered to include these as genuine applicants for pensions.

Mr. ASQUITH: The persons referred to are applicants for and recipients of poor law relief, and the disqualification was intended to be attached to the receipt of poor relief as such. It is not affected by the question whether the amount so received is a final charge against the rates or is recovered from a person or persons legally responsible for the maintenance of the pauper. The disqualification in these cases could be removed only by legislation.

Mr. CROOKS: May I call the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that the relief is frequently not given to the applicants until it is received from the relatives, and there is therefore no actual charge on the rates?

Mr. ASQUITH: I will look into the matter.

Disturbances at Cashel.

Mr. CONDON (Tipperary, E.) in accordance with private notice asked the Irish Secretary if he was aware that on Tuesday last on the occasion of the trial of eight respectable young men at Cashel the police charged through the streets knocking down men, women, and children, striking them with batons while on the ground, and batoning old women as well; and that at night they paraded the streets, burst into private houses and batoned the inmates, and arrested a number of people returning home from an entertainment; also——

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should give notice in the usual way.

Mr. CONDON: It is a matter of public inquiry.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should have first submitted it to me. I cannot tell hearing it in that way whether it is urgent.

Mr. CONDON: I gave notice to the Chief Secretary last night.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he wished to ask the Prime Minister a question. It was certainly contrary to public practice, and almost indecent, that they should be asked on Monday to begin the discussion of the Committee stage of the Education Bill, which raised every sort of difficulty, and affected the interests of every part of the country, and could not be regarded as an agreed Bill; and whether under these circumstances, the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to put off to a later date than Monday the discussion in Committee.

MR. CROOKS: May I ask whether, before the Prime Minister replies to that, he will send a message up to Lansdowne-house and hear what is said there?

MR. ASQUITH said he must take strong exception to the use of the word "indecent." His sole desire in a matter of this kind, and on a Bill which was not controversial, was to meet the convenience of the House. The only chance of this Bill securing the Royal Assent was that it should be regarded as, in substance, a non-contentious Bill. There was no desire on the part of the Government to press it with undue haste, but they must all consider the time of year. They must also bear in mind the fact that, if the Bill was to receive the Royal Assent, it must not only pass through this House, but through another place. With the view of carrying out the legislation the Government had in view, it would be better to commence the Committee stage on Monday. The choice was between doing that or postponing it until Tuesday, and curtailing the interval between the Committee stage and the Report stage. If the right hon. Gentleman and his friends opposite thought they would prefer the later alternative, he should be willing to meet their wishes, but he believed the general convenience of the House would be better served by commencing the Committee stage on Monday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That does not reply to my point. My point was that it is absolutely unprecedented haste in carrying through a measure of this importance. I do not know that anything will be gained if we are not allowed the ordinary space of time habitually given when very big measures are discussed in this House, and if the right hon. Gentleman persists in putting down the Committee stage for Monday, I will say no more at the present time.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Is it the purpose of the Government to have a Saturday sitting next week for the purpose of considering this Bill?

MR. ASQUITH: I am afraid that may be necessary.

SELECTION STANDING COMMITTEES.

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following Twelve Members (in respect of the Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill and the Local Government (Scotland) Bill: Mr. M'Killop, Mr. Barrie, Sir Berkeley Sheffield, Mr. Henry Gooch, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Lord John Joicey-Cecil, Earl of Ronaldshay, Mr. Waldron, Sir Clement Hill, Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh, Mr. M'Kean, and Major Renton.

Report to lie uoon the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) No. 2) BILL).

Motion made and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Elementary Education (England and Wales (No. 2) Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of this House)."—(*Mr. Asquith*).

The House divided:—Ayes, 239; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 416).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)

Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHn.Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson,W.H.(St. Pancras,N
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats,Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch,George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.Sir W.Brampton
Harcourt,RtHn.L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A.G.C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamont, Norman
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murray, Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C.E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Nolfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,RtHn.H.L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
ScottA.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shaw,Sir CharlesEdw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs,N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abindgon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robt.(Lanark,Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon.R.(Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E.(Bury S.Edm.)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir JohnH.
Kerry, Earl of
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants, Fareham
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A. R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Renton, Leslie
Renwick, George
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorge D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Lord Edmund Talbot.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No. 2) BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [25th November], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Hutton.*)

Question again proposed "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I think the House will expect that I should say something on the subject which is engaging all our thoughts; but I desire to preface such remarks as I have to make by the observation that I can only, upon this matter, speak for myself alone. A compromise, or proposed compromise, of this kind, especially with the notice that we have had of it, cannot be regarded as one on which organised opinion can be stated, and I desire to commit nobody but myself to the point of view which I shall endeavour to lay before the House. May I also say that I approach this burning topic with a very special sense of the difficulty of the situation and with the responsibility which attaches to any man who makes the prospect of peace, if prospect of peace there be, more difficult to attain. And certainly, although I cannot think that what I shall say will be agreeable to or consonant with the views of His Majesty's Government, still I think that, when I sit down, they will admit that I have endeavoured as far as possible to avoid anything in the nature of provocative retort or unnecessary acerbity of statement. That course is the easier because I do not think that I am required to discuss the merits of the Bill before the House. I do not think it is the merits of the Bill which are, indeed, under discussion. It is not whether the new system of education which the Government measure contemplates is in itself a desirable system—that is not the point, or at any rate the main point, with which we are dealing. What I conceive the House has got to think of—what each of us has got to think of—in the vote that we shall be asked to give to-night, and in the votes that we shall be asked to give on subsequent stages of the measure, is not the mere bare merits of the Bill, but the question—Is this or is it not what it professes to be, a settlement of the education question?—and it is to that point, and to that point alone, that I desire to address myself. I am quite aware that many Gentlemen naturally have not restricted themselves to that aspect of the question. We have had speeches from both sides of the House explaining how far the solution of the Government departs from the various ideals which Members of this House have formed for themselves as to what ought to be our educational system. The mover of the Amendment we are now discussing—the hon. Member for Morley—gave a description of what he regarded as the consequences of this Bill, which I think must have almost converted some of my friends to the belief that it was an exceedingly good measure for the Church. On the other hand, there have been speeches delivered from this side of the House which I am quite sure suggested to the Nonconformist auditor that after all, perhaps, this measure does not carry with it the peril to the sacredness from denominational teaching of the provided schools which they were afraid it would involve. Those Members on different sides of the House who have discussed the merits of the Bill have probably gone far to converting their opponents to the desirability of supporting it. But I do not propose to enter into the lists either with the hon. Gentleman the Member for Morley or with any of the friends on my side of the House who take the very gloomiest view as to the actual working of the measure, or as to the probability that the measure really would carry out what the Government said they desire to see carried out. I do not propose to discuss that in detail. I am going to confine myself strictly to the question: Is this going to give us—what we all desire—a final settlement—a settlement final within the ordinary reasonable outlook of reasonable men—is it going to give us a settlement of the vexed education question as far as we in this House can look forward? Many Gentlemen seem to think that this Bill is going to give us a settlement because it is a compromise; but while I quite admit that almost every final settlement of any controverted question has in it elements of compromise, I would venture to point out to the House that a compromise is not necessarily a settlement, and we have got to consider the terms of this compromise to see whether or not it does carry within it elements of a permanent or *quasi*-permanent settlement. After all, if the Bill is not a settlement, it is nothing. Nobody defends it on its merits. It has not found in this House, in the whole course of yesterday's debate, so far as I know, one single individual sitting in any quarter of the House as representing any section of public opinion who does not think from his own point of view it is a bad Bill. The Government do not think it a good Bill; the hon. Member for Morley thinks it is an abominable Bill. The spokesman of the Irish Party on this occasion denounced it, or that part of it which affected his co-religionists, in the most uncompromising manner, and nobody who spoke upon these benches, whether they look forward with hope, as does my hon. friend the late Secretary for Education, or whether they look forward without hope, to the future of the measure—not one single individual has found anything to say for it on its intrinsic merits. If it is not a settlement, it is nothing. What ground have the Government for believing and hoping that it is to be a settlement? The President of the Board of Education brought it forward yesterday as if it was in the nature of an agreed treaty between high contracting parties, and, no doubt, like other treaties between high contracting parties, it embodied provisions which neither of the contracting parties wholly approve, but to which they were ready to assent, and on which they were ready to make a permanent treaty of peace. That was the contention of the Government. Who were the high contracting parties? Between whom was the treaty made? A treaty of peace between two countries may carry with it the most admirable and desirable consequences, because each is bound in honour to carry out, even to its disadvantage or partial disadvantage, the provisions of the treaty. Who bound themselves by this treaty? Are the Government bound in the future?

Are the Church party bound? Are hon. Gentlemen opposite bound? Are my hon. friends behind me bound, or the Irish—those for whom the Member for the Scotland Division spoke yesterday? Are the Nonconformist divines bound? Are the bishops bound? I confess I am deeply impressed by the extraordinarily unpractical position, cloudy, obscure, ambiguous, in which we all find ourselves at the present moment in connection with this matter. Let me just go through these various interested parties to whom I have referred. Take the Nonconformist divines. As I understand their attitude, as explicitly stated by high authorities like Dr. Clifford, they say this may be tolerable as a step towards what they call a national system. Quite so. That which is recommended or accepted only as a step cannot in the nature of things be regarded as a settlement. I do not think I shall be accused in this matter of at all exaggerating the attitude which Dr. Clifford and I am sure many gentlemen who are listening to me take up. They look upon the arrangement embodied in the Bill with the deepest distrust, and if they tolerate it at all, they tolerate it because they think it is a stepping-stone to something more in accordance with their preconceived ideas. I do not say the treaty of peace does not bind them, or that they do not mean to be bound by it; but neither Dr. Clifford outside this House nor gentlemen in this House who agree with Dr. Clifford will think of getting up here or elsewhere and saying: "We do not like this measure; we are not pledged to accept it; but we mean to accept it, not merely in this Session, but as a permanent settlement of the whole question." They will not do that; they do not mean to do it. I do not know what opinion hon. Gentlemen opposite have formed of the views of divines belonging to the Anglican Church. We have had so little time to make investigation that I hesitate to give a conclusive opinion upon it; but I should be astonished if a vast majority of the clergy of the Church of England are not found to regard this measure with the utmost suspicion and dislike, which, in itself, mind you, does not necessarily condemn it if it is to be a permanent compromise, but which does condemn it if they can only be required or forced to accept this measure until better times come and a better measure can be modelled more in accordance with their views. But if they accept it in any other spirit than that, they, equally with the Nonconformist divines, are practically in their hearts already contemplating by what future steps this so-called settlement is to be modified so as to suit their views as to the manner in which elementary education shall be carried on in this country. If these statements be true, and surely they are true of the Anglican and Nonconformist divines, what am I to say of the Roman Catholics? As everybody knows, they are to a man opposed to this solution. I do not believe there is a single exception, either in this House or out of it, among those interested in the education of Roman Catholics, or I would add, as far as I know, other bodies of our countrymen who attach the utmost value to denominational education, who do not regard all the provisions in this Bill dealing with their interests as in themselves evil, as necessarily temporary, and as measures which it will be their bounden duty to upset as soon as the power of upsetting them is given. The Government may lightly regard the importance of the Roman Catholic vote in this country, and I imagine that as far as English Roman Catholics are concerned the vote may not be important from the wire-pullers' point of view; and, as far as the Irish Roman Catholics are concerned, no doubt they are bound to the Government by other ties so strong that their difference with the Government on education may not be sufficient to separate them. But, although the Roman Catholic vote may be a negligible quantity politically, do not tell me that any settlement can stand permanently which every earnest and high-minded Roman Catholic in this country thinks an outrage upon his faith and absolutely fatal to the education of his children. And if you embody provisions of that kind in your Bill, is it not as certain as that day follows night that what you call a settlement is predestined to be upset upon the first favourable opportunity by some fresh arrangement of your system introduced in another Session devoted to this thorny, difficult, and embarrassing question, and that you will not be able by this measure to put out of sight this painful controversy? Those who cherish that delusion are destined not only to a very rude, but an early awakening. I turn from the Roman Catholics and ask whether the Radical politicians on the other side regard this as a permanent solution. Does the hon. Member for Morley and his friends regard it as such? We have always been told that the Nonconformists are a most powerful element in the party opposite. Do they conceive themselves bound by this Bill to leave the question of education exactly where this Bill leaves it? Do they regard themselves as pledged in honour to it? I do not believe they do. I think they would be mad if they gave any such pledge. But other Gentlemen give no such pledge, and if they expect to have an opportunity of remodelling it in their own interest, where, I ask, is the element of settlement which we all desire to find in these terms? I turn from the various classes which I have ventured to enumerate, and I ask what is the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury and those most eminent and distinguished prelates who have worked with him and who agree with him. The Government know much more about this than I do. They probably know exactly how they stand with the Archbishop. I confess I do not know. We had a long correspondence published the other day; and, like a well-managed serial story, it stopped just at the interesting point. The last published letter of which we have been put in possession is one from the Archbishop, in which it seems to begin to dawn upon him that the Bill contains provisions which make it utterly unpalatable to himself and his friends. I cannot read this in any other way. He mentions certain points and says—

> "It is because these are not mere incidental financial details, but inherent elements in the structure of a balanced settlement, that I have throughout made my assent to the general plan of settlement depend upon such conditions being satisfactory."

We know nothing as to whether the Archbishop is satisfied with these inherent elements in a balanced settlement—the Government have not yet told us. The Archbishop goes on to say—

> "I am eagerly anxious that we should go forward with the proposed settlement. But you will, I know, recognise the impossibility of our doing so with any degree of general assent, or with the hope of ultimate success, if one limb of the arrangement is paralysed from the outset."

Apparently, according to the Archbishop, it is paralysed.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, we have not had the letter in which he says it is not paralysed. I should very much like to hear how that stands, and I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will be glad to tell us. I was startled to hear on good authority that the Bishop of London, whose name has appeared in the very forefront of all those who desire a settlement—that his opinion is against the Bill as it stands and that he will vote against its Second Reading. How does the Government stand? At what point are these negotiations deficient, and how far are the parties committed, not merely to the Bill of the Government, but to this Bill being regarded as permanent? And, in this connection, I very earnestly ask one quite precise and specific question of the Prime Minister. If this is a treaty between any two parties at all, the high contracting parties are the Government on one side and the Archbishop and certain other members of the episcopal bench on the other. Do the Government conceive that the Archbishop is bound in honour if this Bill passes to withhold his encouragement, indeed, to discourage, any later attempt by which perhaps another Government, with a different balance of parties in this House, might seek to place all sects, all denominations, upon a precisely level and equal basis? I do not know whether it would ever be possible to carry out what I conceive to be the real solution of the education difficulty, but if it is I want to know whether the Government consider that the Archbishop of Canterbury, by giving his adhesion to this compromise, the terms of which he does not, of course, like any more than the other parties to the compromise, is bound to resist any such further reform of our education system. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman will answer me across the floor now or prefer to wait till he speaks. But supposing that the answer is, as I conceive it must be, that the Archbishop is at liberty to-morrow or the day after, or after the next general election, or whenever you like—at the earliest possible moment—to try, if this Bill passes, to amend it by the terms of this compact. If he is not bound, may I ask whether in this agreement between two contracting parties there is the smallest hope or prospect of a permanency? I think it is a most unhappy condition of things, most obscure and difficult as regards this arrangement as considered from the point of view of a treaty. Perhaps you will say: "After all, this is not a treaty. It is an arrangement which, if we can only get it through by Parliamentary pressure or otherwise, has in it such necessary elements of stability that, though there is grumbling now on the part of Nonconformists, of the Church, and of Roman Catholics, practically, when you have got the new system working every one will acquiesce in it." That may be said. Does anybody really say it; does anybody really think it? I have referred to the feelings of the great Nonconformist bodies, politicians, clergy, and leaders in that particular school of educational thought, and I will not refer to them further. But consider the feelings of Churchmen. I do not ask you to say that those feelings are justified, but to consider what they must be, and whether an arrangement which, starting under the shadow of such feelings, can have in it the elements of a settlement. Now, just see what you are doing in the matter of transfers. I am told that since 1902 over £1,000,000 sterling has been subscribed by Churchmen for voluntary schools in this country. I leave out the Roman Catholics and other denominations. We all know that there are cases in which the local authority, perhaps a hostile local authority, has required most costly and difficult changes to be carried out in some voluntary schools. Churchmen in the district have, at immense personal sacrifice, raised the necessary funds, have made the necessary alterations, and acquiesced in the, perhaps, most unreasonable demands of the local authority. I ask hon. Gentlemen opposite what their feelings would be, and appeal to them quite uncontroversially, as men of the world who understand human beings, to say what they would think if money raised at the bidding of the local authority and of the bishops and archbishops in this way, is suddenly confiscated by the local authority itself and put into its own pockets. I appeal to the hon. Member for Morley, whether the Church be right or wrong, whether, while human beings are what they are, it would not be regarded as a most bitter injustice. It is quite true that in the opinion of some persons, and in the opinion of the Archbishop, there are general advantages to the cause of religion and that form of Christianity taught by the Church of England which make up for these local injustices, great as they unquestionably are. But my point is, not what is good for the Church of England as balanced, but that you are starting your so-called compromise by raising so enormous a feeling of grievance among some of those who may be committed to it that you cannot expect them to acquiesce, and that they will not acquiesce. I go from the subscribers to voluntary schools, who are not always large subscribers, to the parents. I again appeal to the hon. Member for Morley to put himself in the position of the parent of a child who has subscribed in quite recent years to a school, because that school is going to teach the denominational religion in which he believes and which is going to belong to his denomination. The Bill passes and the school is transferred to the local authority. He finds that so far from the denomination to which he belongs and for which he has subscribed having any special position in that school it is at a special disadvantage. The child of the parent who does not want denominational education finds everything arranged for him. He has to pay nothing; the headmaster may teach him; all the best rooms of the school are at his disposal. The parent who has subscribed to the making of that school has to go through formularies before he is allowed to have his child taught the religion of the people who made the school. When the religion is being taught him he is given some perfectly insufficient accommodation. He has the knowledge that the State has put its *imprimatur* on this new form of State religion. He is aware that the headmaster is not, or ultimately will not be allowed to teach him religion, and that he is under a stigma, and he is told that he has to pay for what religious teaching he wants in the school that he has built, while his neighbour's child has the religious teaching he wants without any payment for it at all. That really does not exhaust the hardship which will be felt by these people, because you have taken care that, while making them pay for their religious instruction, not one penny that they do pay is to go into the pocket of the man who gives it. Of course, the local authorities will give the same salaries to every teacher of equal grade in the school, whether he volunteers to teach denominational religion or is asked to give Cowper-Temple teaching. The parent pays the education authority—the representatives of the ratepayers. So that the man who helped to build the school is not only in the inferior position described by the Bill, but has got to help his Cowper-Temple neighbour by lessening his rates in payment for his own denominational teaching. There may well be an answer to that, but does not everybody know that that state of things must produce immense bitterness of feeling among the people whom you want to accept this as a final settlement? I am quite sure that they will not be placated by the extraordinary statement of the Secretary of the Board of Education, who seems to think you may divide a trust into two in some extraordinary manner. If a man gives £10,000 for education to be given in a particular way, you cut it into a bigger and a smaller half, and say: "We take the bigger half. It is true that you gave the whole £10,000, thinking that the education was to be denominational, but the denominational part of £10,000 is only £1,500. We give you that back and keep the £8,500 ourselves." That may be bad law; I am sure it is bad equity; but whether it is good or bad law, it will produce an extraordinary feeling of soreness among the great body of clergy and laity. Do the Government consider that, by their contracting-out, they are doing anything in the world except sowing the seeds of fresh difficulties in the immediate future and making it necessary that the whole scheme should be revised, and, by that fact, destroying all hope of a settlement on which we are all asked to accept a Bill of which none of us approve? I do not know what the Government think they do with regard to the money arrangements. They have not told us whether they are to be modified in Committee, but surely it is relatively immaterial. I do not believe that the denominationalists of this country will ever be content with a system of contracting-out. I think it is possible that here and there an Anglican school in a special position or which wishes to have a special *clientele* might welcome the arrangement. But it is quite impossible, that either the great body of Anglicans or Roman Catholics will either desire to be divorced from the national system or to be asked to be content with a fixed Parliamentary grant in these days when education is increasing in cost from, I might almost say, week to week. I am not going to argue the special estimates of the Roman Catholics. I leave all those details on one side. I am asking the House to consider the bigger questions. But I would remind the House of the peroration of the hon. Gentleman opposite, the Secretary to the Admiralty, in the speech he made last night. He asked the House to pass this Bill in order to get the religious difficulty out of the way and thus free the energies of educational reformers to deal with a long catalogue of important questions which he declared quite truly demand their immediate attention. I would remind him of what three of those great educational interests are. One of them is that the qualification of teachers should be raised. Another is that smaller classes should be adopted in all our elementary schools; and the third is that improved buildings should be provided. Now did it occur to the Secretary to the Admiralty that, while he and his friends are gaily setting to work freed from the pre-occupation of dealing with the religious difficulty, there may be other persons interested in education, like the Roman Catholics, who may be just as anxious for the great reforms of which he spoke as he is? Did it further occur to him that all these reforms are in their essence and nature of the most costly description? Did he remember that you cannot raise the qualifications of the teacher, that you cannot make big classes into small classes, and that you cannot make indifferent buildings into good buildings without an enormous expediture of money; and where did he think that expenditure of money is to come from? Is it not manifest and plain on the face of it that, if you carry it out, all the schools which contract-out, except the rich and exceptional schools partly supported by large fees and endowments, all the ordinary schools, especially the Roman Catholic schools, because they affect the poorest of the population, will be left behind in this reforming race which the Secretary to the Admiralty desires to run? While he is adding to the qualifications of teachers, improving buildings, and making classes smaller, their buildings will remain the same, their teachers will remain the same, and their classes will remain unchanged. The difference, which will immediately arise between schools which have rates and taxes behind them and schools which have only taxes behind them will be an enormous difference, and what is more, it will be a growing difference. It is a difference which would be aggravated from year to year. I do not see how you are to get over it, and I do not believe mere money can get over it. It is possible that, if the Government have the mines of Eldorado behind them, they may find a contribution from the taxpayer to these denominational schools so great that they might be bribed, as it were, into acquiescence in their severance from the general national system of education. But I doubt it, and I do not believe that in any case you will be able to find the money or, if you do, that you can possibly employ it without creating the grossest inequality, not merely between school and school, but between district and district. Therefore I confess that it seems to me that, if there were no other blot in this Bill, if there were no other ground for thinking that it did not embody within its four corners the elements of a permanent settlement, those difficulties would emerge in the contracting-out clauses in a form so aggravated and so violent that we must all of us abandon the hope that, if we pass this Bill, we have dismissed the problem of elementary education for more than a few months or a few years. Whether you survey the question from the point of view of the establishment of a contract between the various interested parties or whether you consider the nature and the value of the settlement from the point of view of the sentiment which it is going to arouse in the different classes of the population, or whether you regard it from the educational point of view and from the point of view of those who you admit must have special denominational facilities, I am reluctantly driven to the conclusion that in this direction and in this issue peace is not to be found. I think it is a deplorable conclusion. Nobody more deeply regrets it than I do, but I have attempted to deal with it perfectly candidly and clearly, and I think that those who most differ from me will admit that I have not used one single argument which may be described as other than going honestly and straight to the very centre of our difficulties. I should consider myself as paltering with the truth and as deceiving the House, who at all events have a right in this matter to have my innermost thoughts, if I pretended to find in this more than what I do honestly find—that is, a sincere desire on the part of the framers of the Bill to see a way out of the difficulty. I am sure the Government have done their best, and I am sure the bishops have done their best to find some way out. I do not know what has passed between the Government and the Nonconformist divines. I only imperfectly know what has passed between the Government and the Anglican divines; but I am perfectly ready, indeed anxious, to admit that all the parties to this so-called arrangement have done their best to find some way of settling these difficulties. They have, as I think, failed. They have failed, not from want of good will, but from want of an appreciation of what I think is the core of this problem, the central principle to which everybody must strive, if they are not content with the historic compromises of 1870 or 1902. If you dislike my word, I will choose yours—the historic arrangements of 1870 and 1902. When I just now observed parenthetically that I thought equality of treatment between the different denominations was the only ltimate solution of this problem, an hon. Gentleman below the gangway interrupted me and said: "How about the Act of 1902?" I never pretended in 902, and I have never pretended since 902, that the inherent illogicalities and, f you will, the injustices of the Act of 870 were more than mitigated by the Act of 1902. I entirely agree that, if you ook on the one side at the single-school rea in the country or if you look on the other at those vast urban districts in which there is not a single school where denominational teaching can be given, on whichever side of the picture you look you may say with absolute justice, "Here s an anomalous state of things, which may well require remedy." But the hon. Gentleman who interrupted me must be aware that in this world you must do one of two things. You must build on an historic foundation or you must try to work on fundamental principles. The Act of 1870 itself was only justifiable on historic grounds. The Act of 1902, in so far as it dealt with religion, also was based upon historic grounds, and could be justified upon no other ground, and never was justified upon any other. If you are going to abandon the historic ground, as you are going to do in this Bill; if you are going to say to the Nonconformists, "You must admit denominational teaching in everyone of what used to be called council schools"; if you are going to turn to the Church on the other side and say, "You must give up all the buildings for which you have sacrificed so much"; if you are going to turn to the Roman Catholics and say, "We shall no longer allow you to carry out denominational teaching except under conditions which will make your schools a by-word in education, and will separate you hopelessly from the national system"; you are cutting yourselves adrift from radition, and I believe you will only ind a safe anchorage by trying to go to irst principles. The first principle s that we should try to devise a scheme which should treat every man, Nonconformist, Church of England, Roman Catholic, be he what he may, as nearly on an equality as the imperfections of this imperfect world will allow. It is because you have refused to go that length in this Bill hat you find yourselves in all the difficulties which surround you—difficulties which are predestined to bring this question again to the front in a very short time. But you will say to me: "Why should this logical and symmetrical system which you propose be more permanent than the imperfect solution offered by the Government or the other imperfect solutions which have preceded it?" The reason is that, if you do put everybody on an equality, you will have established a system which commends itself to every man who tries to consider this thing in the daylight of modern toleration. Every man who refuses to accept equality puts himself out of Court, and his claim will never be listened to. Therefore, I say until you have got that equality you will never have full, perfect, complete, and secure peace in this country. The Government themselves will not pretend that this Bill gives equality. It establishes, rightly or wrongly, but it does establish out of public funds a new religion or a new way of looking at religious truths and of teaching these truths. It ostracises by comparison every other way of looking at religious truths, and so long as that disparity exists your so-called arrangement is destined to crumble within the lifetime of every man to whom I am now speaking. It is for that reason that I would earnestly beg the Government to reconsider the whole method with which they approach this question. I do not believe that my plan would be particularly favourably received by many friends of my own. It involves giving up the Church schools, just as it involves giving up the council schools. It involves one single system, in which everybody would be treated alike. But there is no unpopularity I would not be prepared to undergo in supporting the Government in a scheme which tried at all events to give to the parents of this country the kind of education which they desire for their children. We believe that this House has no business to inquire whether the parents of the children are right or wrong, wise or unwise. There are many people who think that in their own hearts the parents prefer Cowper-Temple teaching to Church teaching or any other form of teaching. If this is so, I am content to abide by the result.

But the only principle which can really stand examination, which can be defended on every platform, which would hold water, which would withstand criticism, which is in accordance with all that is best in modern ideas as well as in ancient traditions, is the idea of religious equality, not the spurious form of religious equality which the Government have endeavoured to introduce in this Bill. I congratulate the Government upon the spirit that they have shown on this question. I do so quite honestly and sincerely; and I do not associate myself with those who have criticised the members of the episcopal bench who have perhaps lent themselves occasionally rather rashly to the soft wiles of the Minister for Education. I believe the motives of all concerned have been high motives and good motives; but if I am asked whether, short of the panacea which I have proposed, there is in my judgment any hope of a settlement of this question to be derived from anything which this House can do, I have in all truth, in all sincerity, and with great sorrow, to admit that that is not my conviction.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I gladly acknowledge that the right hon. Gentleman in the speech which he has made has completely fulfilled the intention which he announced at the outset of avoiding any manifestation either of the spirit of acerbity or of the language of provocation. But none the less I confess to a sense of profound disappointment at the conclusion to which he has felt himself compelled to arrive. I should have been quite content, were it not out of respect to the right hon. Gentleman, to have left the case for the Second Reading of this Bill as it was presented with extraordinary lucidity and persuasiveness last night by my right hon. friend and colleague the President of the Board of Education, to whose tact and judgment and moderation and fine temper it is largely, and so far as the Government is concerned, I may say mainly, indeed exclusively, due that we are able to submit these proposals to the House. As the right hon. Gentleman has said, and said with truth, the debate upon a proposal of this kind necessarily cannot be cast in the dialectical mode of our ordinary party conflicts. I agree with him that this is not a measure which either the Government or any other party in any quarter of the House, if they were acting upon their own initiative, and if they were putting forward proposals which they believed would attain their own ideals, would have submitted to Parliament. And he, if I may venture to say so, quite rightly and quite logically has approached the question from the only point of view which is relevant to a measure submitted under these conditions—namely, not from the point of view of whether it is ideally the best solution of a difficult political problem, but whether it does contain the elements of a reasonable and workable settlement. Upon that point there are, I think, two questions which every one in the House must ask himself. The first question, with which the right hon. Gentleman has dealt very lightly, though I may assume he would have answered it in the affirmative, is this—whether the time has not come when, in the interests of all parties, and above all of that section of the community so much talked about but often so little regarded in this great controversy—namely, the children of England—whether the time has not come when something in the nature of an agreed settlement is not only politic but absolutely necessary? The right hon. Gentleman has said a great deal about the precariousness and the short duration of any settlement that is likely to be attained upon the lines here proposed. Let us look back for a moment upon the past. Look back to the Act of 1870. I am stating, not a matter which is capable of controversy, but a matter of universal acknowledgment among those who are acquainted with history, when I say that the Act of 1870 embodied a compromise, and a compromise which was heartily disliked both upon one side and upon the other. It was not liked by those who represented the Church of England in those days, because, side by side with a voluntary system to which they had made by far the greatest contribution of any denomination in this country, they saw set up a system of school boards, and in the schools provided by the school boards under the Cowper-Temple clause sectarian teaching at the expense of the rates was excluded altogether. It was equally disliked by the Nonconformists; and I do not think there is any historical fact better attested in our electoral history than that it was largely due to the resentment of the Nonconformists at what they conceived to be their betrayal by the leaders of the Liberal Party at that day, that the great defeat of Mr. Gladstone in 1874 was due. Well, there was a settlement, or a compromise rather—I will not call it a settlement—which started with just the same drawbacks and disadvantages—more accentuated, more acute, and much more inflamed in point of passion and temper—as the proposals which the Government is now submitting to the House. But what was the result? I am not exaggerating when I say that for twenty years it produced something in the nature of educational peace. It brought about a co-operation, nowhere more remarkably exhibited than in the School Board for London, between Nonconformists and Churchmen working together, in which they combined their energies and sank their differences, and as far as possible helped to promote the development of the educational interests of the children. If that took place in 1870 under conditions such as I have described, are we too sanguine—are we the victims of an untenable and unjustifiable credulity—if we suggest that to-day people, none of whom in themselves and by themselves, would have selected this particular *via media* that we are submitting to the House, may, working in the same spirit, and with the same honest desire for peace and for educational efficiency, attain, at any rate, another truce which may last perhaps an equally long time? Because what has been the history of the last ten years? I will not go into the question of how it was, both upon one side and upon the other, that in the course of time defects in the settlement of 1870 developed themselves and became more and more apparent, were felt more and more acutely, and produced on the one side the Nonconformist discontent at the condition of things prevailing, particularly in the rural schools, and the discontent on the part of Churchmen in regard to the state of things in particular which prevailed in the urban districts. The fact is, whatever be its historical explanation, we have now been suffering, for more than ten years, from a condition of educational warfare. There was the Bill of 1896, the Act of 1897, the Act of 1902, and all the turmoil and controversy which has gone on in connection with the successive Bills which the present Government have introduced; and, after twenty years of comparative peace, we have had twelve or thirteen years of unsettlement, warfare, turbulence, and no progress. Would it not be the duty of any responsible Government—I do not care to what party they belonged, or what their educational tendencies and desires might be—to try and devise some means by which another truce could be arrived at, a fresh period of educational peace entered upon, and the whole energies of the persons engaged in this great domain of social and philanthropic activities concentrated, not upon the points upon which they differed but upon the points upon which they ought to be at one? That, at all events, appeared to me, long before I held my present office, but particularly since I held it, to be the first object which any Government of this country ought to aim at. We may fail. Well, I would rather fail in the attempt to obtain peace on reasonable terms than not to have made the attempt at all. This is not an occasion on which we desire to draw the ordinary weapons of party warfare. I believe there is an honest desire on both sides of the House—nowhere more clearly manifested than in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman—to devise a way. But I quite agree that that does not exonerate me and my colleagues from the obligation to show that in the proposal which, under very unusual conditions, we are submitting to the House there is a reasonable prospect of attaining such a settlement. What are the conditions? Surely I shall carry everybody with me when I say that the conditions of a durable settlement in a matter of this kind are that upon both sides there should be a surrender of what is secondary and subordinate, without any sacrifice of what is primary and fundamental. I quite agree that unless the settlement—I do not say in all its details, but in its broad and general outlines—conforms to that condition, it is not one which should be pressed upon Parliament, and which Parliament should be asked to accept. What are the right hon. Gentleman's objections to the proposals which we have brought forward? In the first place he says—Who are the parties to your agreement; are they plenipotentiaries; have they power to bind those in the country whom they assume to represent; and are they really at one? I think that is a misconception of the situation. This Bill is not put forward as a request to Parliament to ratify an already concluded treaty between sovereign powers; nothing of the kind. What happened was this, that the Government, through informal communications with the representatives of Nonconformity on the one hand, with the highest authorities in the Anglican Church upon the other, and with some communications—not so frequent and continued as I should have liked—with the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church—the Government, without pretending for a moment that these various parties had entered into a deed or agreement, signed, sealed, and delivered, thought they had come sufficiently near—within a measurable and approximate distance of one another—so that they themselves might take the responsibility of putting down on paper proposals which they thought might meet with general agreement, and this Bill represents that attempt. The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that the Nonconformists whom we consulted probably exceeded their authority; that the Bishops, in the course which they took, had no power to bind the clergy; and that the Roman Catholics were altogether left out of account. That would be a very relevant criticism if we were putting forward this Bill as an absolute concluding settlement. But the question is whether, having regard to all that has passed, Parliament may not itself say: "These people ought to have agreed, or, at least, we ought to lay down in an Act of Parliament, the terms upon which the question in future shall be settled, because the points which separate them are of so comparatively small importance, and the gap between the one and the other is so easily capable of being bridged by bringing common sense to bear that there is really no excuse for their not agreeing." I would like to say one word about the Roman Catholics. The right hon. Gentleman has used language which I was sorry to hear. He said this Bill had been denounced by those representing the Roman Catholic Church as an outrage upon their faith. There is not a Roman Catholic in this House but knows perfectly well this Bill is not put forward in that sprit or with that intention. There is the provision for contracting out. We regret that—I think everyone regrets it—and would rather see a universal national system in which every school was subject to the same conditions. The system of contracting out proposed in this Bill, of which it is believed the Roman Catholic Church will largely take advantage, is a system which prevails largely in Scotland. It is a system of which we in Scotland, and I speak as a Scottish Member, have never complained. We are not sufficiently liberally treated in Scotland, certainly, but that is a point for accommodation and adjustment and is not a question of principle. The sum now actually paid out of State grant in respect of Roman Catholic children in Scotland is about 40s. per head. Under this Bill it will be about 50s. per head. Therefore, for the right hon. Gentleman to tell us, in regard to this Bill, that a proposal of this sort can be regarded by Catholics as an outrage upon their feelings is, I venture to say, an abuse of Parliamentary language. I pass to what will be gained by the other two parties. We have the Nonconformists on the one side, and the Church of England on the other. Let me for a few minutes put down the two sides of the account, the gain on the one side and the loss on the other, as if it were a question of debtor and creditor, and we were constructing a balance-sheet. What do the Nonconformists gain? In the first place, they gain complete popular control wherever rate-aid is given and untested teachers. They gain, in the second place, complete prohibition of rate-aid for sectarian teaching. In these two things they have gained in essence and in substance what we pledged ourselves to obtain. On the other hand, what does the Church of England gain? The Church of England, in the first place, gains the thing for which her advocates in this House have striven strenuously and persistently ever since I have been here. The Church of England gains the right to follow her children with her own definite, dogmatic teaching into the provided schools of the country. As the hon. Member for Oxford University said last night, the value of that right depends upon the use which the Church of England makes of it. But I venture here strongly to protest against the notion that there is anything in this Bill which is intended to make that right of entry anything in the nature of an illusory or a nugatory right. I think a fear was expressed that in order to exercise that right clergymen would have to go through formularies, and that in some way or another they would be embarrassed and impeded in the exercise of that right which the law will give. That is not the intention. They have only to write their name on a bit of paper and the thing is done. Anything simpler or more effective for the purpose we, at any rate, have not been able to devise. If it can be shown in Committee that there is anything in the clause which requires greater simplicity and clearness, we shall be ready to consider it. The only condition attached to this right of entry—most offensive as it has always been regarded, and must be regarded, not only by Nonconformists, but by persons specially interested in education, and by none more so than the teachers—the only conditions by which we propose to fetter its exercise are the necessary safeguards for due order and the proper conduct of the school. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself in the published correspondence has admitted, and very properly admitted, that any such right must be granted subject to the necessary administrative conditions, and those are the only conditions that will be imposed. Then, what is the other gain? I will not here speak about the head teacher, although that is a point to which great importance is attached, but it is a temporary arrangement, and I am now speaking of permanent gains. In all but single-school areas, where the Church wishes to preserve, or to bring into existence, schools of her own type, where the teacher will be chosen by members of the religious denomination itself, subject to any tests they may see fit to impose, and where the curriculum of the school in regard to religious teaching will be such in all respects as the authorities of the Church in the locality desire, she will be able to do so, not at the expense of the rates, but with a liberal provision out of the public Exchequer. There are two considerations laid down in the correspondence between the Archbishop and myself on this point. The one was, what I was ready to concede, that in the provision made for these schools they should be given "a reasonable chance," I think was the phrase used, of existence. The other was a condition to which the Archbishop was quite ready to subscribe—namely, that at the same time a substantial part of the expenses of carrying on the schools should be borne by the denomination. I am not going into the question now, because it is a question for the Committee stage of the Bill, of whether these conditions have been actually carried out in the provision made in the schedule of the Bill. We believe that they have been. But I must enter a passing protest against the language used by the right hon. Gentleman just now in his denunciations of this part of the Bill. This provision of contracting out is not new. It was proposed, as every one will remember, in the Bill of 1906. At that time the provision proposed to be made for the contracting-out schools was very substantially less than the provision which we are proposing in this Bill, and the right hon. Gentleman himself told us on 24th July, 1906, in the debate on the contracting-out Amendment:

> "That a peaceful settlement of the question was to be found in the direction of accepting this Amendment rather than rejecting it."

Having taken up that attitude in 1906, the right hon. Gentleman could not now say there was anything objectionable in point of principle to contracting-out.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: All I did was to say that I preferred the Amendment to the Bill. I thought the Amendment improved the Bill, and that, as compared with the Bill, it made for peace.

MR. ASQUITH: To use the right hon. Gentleman's own analogy, he was in the position of the man who was given his choice of being drowned or hanged, and who said he preferred neither. We have reached the stage now at which we must, all of us, make a certain surrender in matters of this kind. None of us can pursue exactly the line he would like to. The right hon. Gentleman chose the contracting-out Amendment rather than the Bill of 1906, as being more likely to lead to peace. I have tried briefly to summarise what I have called the balance-sheet between Nonconformists on the one side, and the Church of England on the other. Does it not contain the basis of a reasonable settlement? I must add, though we are now on Second Reading, that an arrangement of this kind is in its nature of such a character that you cannot—when you come to deal with its details as we shall presently in Committee—treat it as though each part was separable and independent. You can very easily upset the balance, and when you have upset the balance and destroyed the equilibrium'the whole thing is gone. I say that, of course, as the House will readily understand, without prejudice to the fullest right and opportunity for discussion of the details in Committee but only to make it clear that the Government are submitting the thing as a whole in the belief that each side is giving up a great deal, and, on the other hand, that each side is receiving some substantial equivalent. Surely after these ten or twelve years of tumult and controversy we may without any sacrifice of honour or principle, either upon one side or upon the other, fitly bring to a conclusion the labours of an unusually arduous and exceptionally combative session by giving, with something like general consent, to the educational system of this country, for the first time for many years, the chance of a life of real efficiency and peace.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said this was a question on which they had had during the last ten years a conflict of the most extraordinary character among all parties in the House. In the year 1902, he himself voted side by side with the Member for Morley and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, against some of the provisions of the Act of that year. In 1906, he found himself with his colleagues on these benches dividing against those two hon. Members, who opposed the Act of that year; and now in 1908 he found himself again with the hon. Member for Morley opposing this Bill. He thought one ought to draw from these extraordinary and kaleidoscopic changes in parties and individual Members of the House in the course of these controversies on the education question the lesson that it was wise not to use too bitter language, because they might find themselves next year side by side with the very men who were opposing this Bill. They had heard one of the foremost champions of the Church in that House in his zeal denouncing the bishops of his own Church as having been traitors to the cause. The noble Lord the Member for Marylebone had declared his incapacity to follow the twistings and turnings of the episcopal mind. The hon. Member for North West Manchester had declared that the Churchmen of Lancashire would not allow themselves to be ridden down by any body of bishops. That was another instance of the extraordinary effect of this controversy on the minds of hon. Members. The Member for Morley, in moving the rejection of the Bill, drew a terrible and lurid picture of the consequences which would happen to him and to his friends and to all that Nonconformists held most dear, if the Bill were passed into law. He said that the consequence of the admission of the clergy to the provided schools of the county councils would be most disastrous, and that the Nonconformists of England were now called upon to surrender all that they had fought for during the last ten years, and the worst and bitterest thing of all was that this surrender came not with a great party defeat, but with an unparalleled party victory. His old friend, Mr. Hirst Hollowell, had used this extraordinary language—that the acceptance of a scheme like this would turn the Liberal Party into a clerical party, and thus prepare the way for its fall and obscuration. Speaking of Clause 4 of the Chief Secretary's Bill of 1906, a clause by the way which both the hon. Member and his friends helped largely to wreck, he said that that unfortunate clause would have made sectarian schools more sectarian still, but the present proposals would admit sectarian creeds into nearly 7,000 schools, which up to this day had been absolutely free from sectarian instruction. There was a great deal of truth in these two statements, and in his opinion, which might be of some worth, as he had followed this controversy as closely as any man in that House, the Nonconformists were asked under this Bill to surrender a great deal more than they were asked to surrender under the Bill of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. In regard to Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906, it was the hon. Member for Morley who was largely responsible for the destruction of that provision, and who said that those for whom he spoke would not tolerate its re-introduction. That was not the advice some of them had urged upon hon. Members when they were in opposition; and Members of the Irish Party felt that if the Bill, as finally agreed upon, had been brought up again in January or February of 1907, and sent to the House of Lords with a majority of 340, because Irish Members on those benches would have supported it, they would not have had the difficulties which confronted them now. They would have come fresh from the constituencies with a mandate on this subject, and they would have been in a position to teach the Lords a lesson which certainly was a good deal wanted. The Member for Morley himself was one of the chief instruments in wrecking that settlement.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said this was the first time he had heard it suggested that the Bill of his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary was to be reintroduced.

MR. DILLON said he had suggested publicly in that House more than once, that the Bill should be again introduced, and he believed that the Bill would have been re-introduced but for the fact that the Nonconformists of this country would not tolerate it. That was his view and he remembered that he was laughed at when he ventured to say to some of his friends on the opposite benches, who were somewhat bitter in the controversy, that they might go farther and fare worse. His words had come true. They had gone further and they had fared worse, at least in their own judgment. The hon. Member for Denbigh District, who seconded the Motion for the rejection of this Bill, said, he thought, perfectly truly, that one of the chief grounds of objection to it was that it would introduce into the schools of this country a totally new system, and one entirely inconsistent with and destructive of one of the main principles of the Liberal Party, namely, a system of endowed religion. For the first time the Liberal Party was proposing to endow a system of religious teaching, to establish it, and to make it absolutely compulsory. He did not wish to use any language that would be considered offensive. Far from it. But he found an expression used by a man whose name would carry great weight, the Rev. Scott Lidgett, President of the Wesleyan Conference, who had taken a great interest in this subject. He was a supporter of this compromise although he objected and always had objected to the right of entry, but he was reconciled because Cooper-Templeism would be the established religion of the national schools. That, he should say, was his expression, not his own, and he thought it was an unfortunate expression. Let him give this warning. They could not get a settlement of this question by a process which established one form of religious teaching, which passed over and made them pay, or made the people for whom he was speaking pay, for the religious teaching, which placed the religious teaching, which they considered essential to their religious convictions, in an inferior position, and told them then that they must pay for it themselves. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who seconded the motion for the rejection of the Bill, that it was a principle hopelessly at variance with their long declared principles of Liberal policy. He recalled the fact that as a strong friend and advocate of friendly compromise upon this question he came to that conclusion long ago when listening to the debates in 1906 and 1907. He came to the conclusion that there could be no settlement of this particula question which was the result of a party victory. Why? Because they could not settle such questions without taking into account the religious and conscientious convictions of the people whose interests were dealt with. If they tried it, it would be a signal for war, and, therefore, he had always felt that except by mutual concession it could never be settled. He therefore, would naturally be a strong friend, as he had proved to his detriment sometimes, of a settlement by compromise, so that if he could see his way to do so, he would gladly support this compromise. He remembered a conversation he had with the late Cardinal Vaughan in 1908. He differed from him very strongly upon the line of the policy he was adopting, and told him that if he persisted upon that line of policy, two things would happen, either he would end in securing a settlement driving religious teaching out of the schools altogether, or, as he thought more likely, there would be a Protestant settlement behind their backs, leaving Catholics out in the cold. Now that was what had happened. He foresaw that for years. Why? Anyone who studied these debates carefully ought, he thought, to have arrived at that conclusion. He saw that, although there was bitterness on this subject between the occupants of the benches on either side of the House, there was no difference of principle. Although Churchmen and Nonconformists were strongly divided in their views on some points, they were not really irreconcilable. They did not object to Cowper-Templeism. They did not object to Cowper-Temple teaching and they knew that many members of the Church party regarded Cowper-Temple teaching as most excellent Protestant teaching. Of course that immediately divided them from Catholics by an impassable gulf. He did not say that they might not be able to carry on many of these controversies, but he always foresaw that there was a great danger that both sides would agree to a settlement to which Catholics were not party at all. That was exactly what had happened, and when the Prime Minister said that this was the result of a conference, he must say that the Catholics were not really consulted, and that they were not in any sense or degree a party to the present settlement. He did not want to introduce any recrimination, bitterness, or provocation. There had been a great deal too much of that. While he could not for a moment accept the Bill as fair or tolerant to Catholics, he saw in it a clear proof of an earnest desire on the part of the Government according to their lights to do something for the Catholics, but their lights were insufficient. The Catholics were not a party to the negotiations. In the first place he attached very great importance to the provision allowing them to build their new schools, which was a great and burning question. Also he attached great importance to allowing their children so far as working centres and medical inspection were concerned inside the national system. He attached great importance to the provision allowing the Catholic teachers to remain inside the national system so far as pension privileges were concerned. But admitting all their improvements in the Bill and also the small increase in the grant, the arrangement was one which the Catholics could not accept. To come to the kernel of the whole situation, here was a passage from the last letter from the Minister for Education in his correspondence with the Archbishop—

> "We have endeavoured to frame a scale of grants to the contracted-out schools so that they should be given a reasonable chance of existence, but of course we have always held and expressed the view that where the owners of schools desired to retain the management and patronage in their own hands, they must make a substantial contribution for the privilege."

That was where they took their stand and differed totally from the view of the Government. Evidently the idea had got embedded in the mind of the Government that they regarded it as a privilege to remain outside the national system. For years they had claimed their right to come into it, and if they were to be put outside the national system it was an outrageous proposition that an indefensible and impossible position to take up that they were to pay for the privilege. It was useless to argue—he did not know that the Secretary for Education would argue—that no scheme could be devised which would meet Catholic consciences and allow them to come into the national system. He was estopped from that argument because his own Government had devised a scheme in the Chief Secretary's Bill which they, on behalf of the Catholics of this country, had accepted.

Therefore it could never be said again truthfully that if they were put out of the national system they were accorded a privilege for which they were to be called upon to pay.

*MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I wish to understand the hon. Gentleman's point of view. Does he not regard it as a privilege that the Church to which he belongs should have the appointment of teachers and be exempt from many of the restrictions which are imposed on provided schools?

MR. DILLON said he did not when it was combined with expulsion from the national system. They had accepted Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906, which brought them into the national system and gave the appointment of teachers to the public body, thereby getting rid of the whole of this unfortunate system of contracting-out which was condemned by every educationist. The National Union of Teachers were strongly against it, the Catholic teachers were all up in revolt against it, and there was not a single teacher in Ireland who supported contracting-out, and yet they were told they were to pay for the privilege of being expelled. He hoped he had disposed once for all of that argument. He wished earnestly to remove from the minds of the Government the idea that they would ever consider it a privilege to be allowed to contract-out, but they preferred to contract-out on reasonably fair terms rather than have their schools completely taken away and destroyed. He had been engaged in very hot controversy over this question, but he was not one of those who had engaged in any mud slinging at the Nonconformists. He had always insisted that among them were some of the best friends they had, who had put a severe strain on their conscientious convictions in order to meet them, and they had good reason to know that in the course of the debates on the Irish University Bill the hon. Member for North-West Norfolk and other Nonconformists saw that Bill through when, if they had given way to their prepossessions, the Bill would never have lived. The hon. Member who, he knew, was sincerely desirous of meeting them, said: "When the demand is made in a Protestant country for Catholic schools for Catholic children taught by Catholic teachers at the public expense, this is a demand which connot be met." First of all he asked why not? The demand was met frankly and fully long ago in Germany, which was one of the few countries in Europe where there was no educational war of any kind. Had it ever occurred to hon. Members opposite to ask why Germany was so far ahead in matters of education? They got rid of religious controversy years ago by a frankly denominational system, meeting all the demands of the Catholics, Protestant country though she was. It lay upon the hon. Member to explain why he took up that position. Protestants had always professed to set up Protestantism as synonymous with civil and religious liberty. Were they prepared to prove that in connection with this Bill? It was no use appealing to foreign countries. The question was, what were they prepared to do? When they applied the criterion of actuality of facts to the statement of the hon. Member for North-West Norfolk they found they were, by contracting-out, providing for Catholic schools and Catholic children by Catholic teachers at public expense. They were doing the very thing that he said could not be done. They were giving away the principle absolutely. They recognised that in this Protestant country they must provide Catholic schools for the Catholic children, but they were fining the parents and punishing the children and the teachers by putting the brand of inferiority upon them and giving them smaller salaries because they adhered to their religious convictions. If these Catholic children went into the board schools, immediately they got into a better atmosphere. There was better provision for them and larger salaries for the teachers, and by getting a better class of men they acted on the children at once. But they were not maintaining any principle. They admitted that this was a case which was affected by the Bill and by the whole course of policy of the Government, but they said: "Yes; we shall allow Catholic schools for Catholic children, but they must be inferior schools, and the children and the teachers must suffer." When it was put in that way, and that was the true way to put the case, it was absolutely indefensible. It could not stand. And of course the case was made much stronger by the fact that this prescription of inferiority was levelled against the poorest part of the population. There were a good many Anglican schools to whom the privilege of charging fees might be an alleviation of contracting-out, because in some districts, and in one or two Catholic schools, perhaps, the charging of fees was a rather popular thing. It might seem strange, but it was so. But in nine-tenths of the Catholic schools the privilege of charging fees was simply a mockery and only increased the outrage of driving them out of the national system by saying to the poorest people of the country: "You may pay for your children in the schools if you choose, but all the children of those who are better off than yourselves will get free education because they are not Catholics, and have no conscientious difficulty in the matter." In his opinion this provision for contracting-out was absolutely indefensible, and was, as clearly as anything could be, a penalty on people for religious convictions. As long as that was maintained it was idle to talk to him of a settlement. He had always preached to his people that they ought to seek for a settlement, and above all a settlement through the Liberal Party. He had been denounced up hill and down dale by great ecclesiastics and by members of his own church in this country for preaching that doctrine. He had always said that if they got a settlement from the Liberal and the Nonconformist parties it would be permanent, whereas a settlement from the Conservative party might be good for a time but would be upset whenever the Liberals came into office. That was why he thought a settlement from the Liberal Party would be more likely to be lasting, and that was the reason why he supported the settlement of 1906. He preached the doctrine of compromise in 1902 because he thought it would have been infinitely better for the Conservative party and the Church party to have compromised this matter when they were in power, when they would have secured better terms than they were getting now. That view, however, was not listened to at the time, with the result that they had been driven to their present position. He had been looking at an interesting Return published that morning giving the figures for all the counties, county boroughs, and London, of the cost per head, and he had calculated what the Catholic share would be under the Schedule. They were offered an average grant of 49s. 6d., and he fully recognised what had been said about the pooling system. Taking London the amount was 94s. as compared with 49s. for the Catholic schools. That was to say, the Catholic schools lost £2 5s. per head per child.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): Will the hon. Member kindly state what that 94s. includes?

MR. DILLON said he was taking the Return published that morning.

MR. RUNCIMAN: If the hon. Member will look on page 2 he will find a large number of items of expenses and maintenance in the 94s. which will not necessarily fall on the other schools to which he refers.

MR. DILLON said he suspected those charges were not very heavy. Supposing, however, they made an allowance. The figures for London gave 94s. 3d., which represented a loss of 44s. 9d., but he would place it at £2 per head per child in Catholic schools. Did any reasonable man propose that in the poorest schools in London, except the Jewish schools, it was fair to start them on their new career with a dead deficiency of £2 per head per child? Taking a Catholic school in London with 1,000 children it meant a loss of £2,000 a year, and yet they were expected to compete with other schools getting the full grant. This gap would go on increasing, and such a system was really inconceivable and impossible. The right hon. Gentleman sought to show that the pooling arrangement would do very much for them, but he very much doubted it, because it would apply mainly to Catholic schools in the large county boroughs. In Liverpool the grant was 74s. 6d., but the Catholic schools received only 49s. 6d., leaving a deficiency of 25s. 10d. per child. If they took off the 4s., that left a deficiency of 21s. In Manchester the grant was 70s. 6d., the Catholic grant being 49s. 6d., leaving a deficiency of 21s. Every one of the great centres where the Catholic schools were situated would be severely hit. He took it that this Bill was a decree of destruction against those schools. He could not believe that the Government realised what they were doing when they embarked on this principle. Finally, he desired to make an earnest appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite to draw a lesson of toleration from what had occurred during the past few months. They might have had the Bill of 1906 if they had met the Catholics in a proper and fairer spirit, and that would have saved them altogether the invasion of their board schools which was now proposed. The other night they heard the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Oxford University making a most remarkable declaration which had influenced many Anglicans in this country. He said that there was hardly a week passed when they had not read of Anglican schools being transferred to the public authority, and he further declared that the Anglican schools were a diminishing and dwindling quantity, whilst the board schools were rapidly increasing. He had no such complaint to make, because the Catholics never transferred a school. They had never read of a Catholic school being transferred, and Catholic schools were not a diminishing quantity. Catholics were fighting for a great principle, and they would stick to their present lines as long as they could. He asked the right hon. Gentleman in the interval between now and the Committee stage to see whether the Government could not devise some means of allowing the Catholic schools to remain inside the national system on the terms that were offered them by the Government of 1906.

*MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said he was sure the hon. Member for East Mayo would allow him to say that it had been his lot to listen to the speech he had just made more than once. That, however, did not diminish its force, and he quite recognised the Catholic position. He was rather astonished to hear the hon. Member say that there was a better atmosphere in council than in Catholic schools.

MR. DILLON: No, I did not say that.

*MR. ELLIS said it had been his lot to accompany Catholic priests into their schools, and no one appreciated more than he did the self-sacrificing efforts of his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects to preserve their schools. He had always said that Roman Catholics in this matter were in an exceptional position. It was true that they had preserved their schools, but relatively to the total number, the children in the Roman Catholic schools were a diminishing quantity. Out of 7,000,000 children in average attendance in the schools of this country there were little more than 250,000 in Roman Catholic schools. Therefore, the matter came quite within reasonable compass and he was prepared to be not only just but generous as regards finance for educational efficiency. He had listened with a little regret to what had fallen from the Leader of the Opposition. It was true that the right hon. Gentleman said that he did not speak for the whole of the party which he led in this House. As he listened to the right hon. Gentleman conjuring up all sorts of evils he could not help reflecting how little they were in accord with the real facts of the case as he knew them in urban and in country districts. He remembered very well in the debates on the Bill of 1902 asking the Leader of the Opposition whether he had ever sat upon a local education authority in his life, and whether he had really taken any part in the practical administration of our educational system. The right hon. Gentleman admitted at once that that had not been his lot, and it was a great deal owing to that defect that the right hon. Gentleman had spoken in the way he had done in this debate. The right hon. Gentleman had drawn a terrible picture of a parent subscribing to the erection of a particular school to secure that his child should be taught in his own faith and then finding his child relegated to some dark and inconvenient room to receive religious instruction. The right hon. Gentleman had drawn an alarmist picture of what was going to happen. They all knew very well that common sense, fair play, generosity, and practical acquaintance with life on the spot which the local authorities possessed would not permit anything of that kind to happen. He welcomed very warmly and heartily from the bottom of his heart the change of tone which had come over the debate this year, yesterday, and so far as the debate had proceeded that night, as contrasted with what he could recollect in previous years on the educational controversy. He believed there was no subject in regard to which the people outside were more sick of hearing the House of Commons occupied in than educational debate. He approached the matter in the spirit so well laid down by the Bishop of Southwark. He said—

> "We are in the position of men who have battled long, and fought for our principles hard, against opponents who have done the like. We have grown in the process more sure of the truth and consistency of our convictions. But so, we observe, have they. Perhaps we have both learnt that there are strong points in the other's case. And now the time has come, and the moment (perhaps a brief one) is here, when both charity and wisdom invite us to remember that there are some controversies which can never be fought out to an end; that when a question becomes really national, a national solution cannot tally with, or even fully embrace, partial claims; that principles need not be forgotten because they are not driven up to the hilt; and that a particular controversy, however important, must be handled, with a view to the interests of the larger life amidst which it occurs."

These words might well be the keynote of those who supported this Bill and the compromise which lay in it. When the arrangement was made in 1870 Nonconformists did not like a great deal that was contained in the Act of that year, but as time went on the common sense of the local authorities in the different localities enabled them to work the measure beneficially and with a success quite different from that prophesied when it was passing through the House of Commons. In the debates which took place then all sorts of evils were prophesied, but these evils did not occur when the Act came to be administered by the people in the localities. The same thing would take place if this Bill became law. The Leader of the Opposition had that day foretold difficulties which would happen from the passing of the Bill, but he did not think they were likely to arise in actual working. He believed that if throughout England the system of establishing a school board in every parish had been followed they might have had in this country locally elected bodies administering education as satisfactorily as in Scotland, where, under the Act of 1872, the school board system was general. In England since 1870 there had been two systems running and the position had become more and more involved. The question came to be whether the Church schools should come on the rates. Everyone could foresee what would result if they did. The the Archbishop of Canterbury said he was perfectly certain that if the Church of England schools accepted aid from the rates, public control would follow. Facts and figures were all one way in this matter. A Return was issued the other day which was very significant. Taking the two school years 1901–2 and 1906–7, the total number of school places in the first period were 6,726,000, and of these 3,723,000 were in denominational schools, or 56 per cent. of the whole. In 1906–7 the proportion had fallen to 49 per cent., there being a greater number of places in council schools. The figures of attendance were more striking. In the first period 46 per cent. of the children at school were in council schools, and in the latter period 54 per cent. The denominational element in our system was diminishing, both actually and relatively. Under these circumstances the question was whether it was wise to go into this compromise or settlement. From his point of view the question of public control was the fundamental and vital matter. He once committed himself in this House to the statement that he would even give up the Cowper-Temple clause if necessary, to secure popular control. By the Bill now before the House they were extending the system of popular control and they were also maintaining the Cowper-Temple clause. He wished to say a word about the secular solution. On that subject his hon. friend the Member for Leicester made an interesting speech. Lord Hugh Cecil had committed himself to the statement that any Government that proposed to abolish the Bible and religion from the people's schools in this country, would not be allowed to exist. The hon. Member knew very well that such a proposal would not be approved by the people of Leicester. There had been a school board system in Leicester which was appreciated by the people there and they were abundantly satisfied with it. If the hon. Member attempted to define secularism, he would find it as difficult as would be the effort to define socialism. Both meant different things to different people, and they were not within the range of practical politics. The people of this country were not so doctrinal as was sometimes supposed. They were profoundly religious, and he believed the wished it to be the basis of the education of their children. But a religious atmosphere in the schools did not necessarily imply the recital of creeds. The unseen verities in which most of them in this House believed were too deep and too sacred to be always put in terms of human speech. Therefore, he for one would resist to the utmost the idea of banishing the Bible and simple Bible-teaching from the schools. They were under obligation to those Gentlemen on both sides who with assiduity had considered this question and arrived at a concordat. In commercial matters he had always held that there was no such thing as a good bargain unless it was good for both sides. He did not believe in one man getting the better of another, and so in the great matter of national education, he welcomed, and was grateful for, the spirit shown by those who had conducted the negotiations. He believed they had arrived in this great matter of national education at the golden moment, and he earnestly hoped that the House of Commons would not allow this session to close without being able to say that this statute was a statute of the realm.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he wished to begin his observations with a word of personal explanation. He did so the more readily because the last time he intervened in a somewhat similar debate he was told by the President of the Board of Trade that his recent connection with the Government rather limited his freedom. He might be assumed to be in an even more delicate position now than he was in connection with the matter to which his right hon. friend referred. He had been in all the educational controversies of this Parliament, and his name was on the back of three Bills. If he said a word against the principle embodied in those Bills he would do so unconsciously and against his will. He was in favour of all they contained, and his friendliness to the Government's proposals up to the present had not changed one whit. He thought the first Bill of 1906 was a good Bill, and if his Nonconformist friends had stretched their consciences sufficiently to accept it, they would have escaped with one-tenth of the concessions which they would have to make if this Bill were carried into law. The atmosphere was full of conciliation. He had been a man of conciliation from the first. He had often spoken on education questions, and he had never said a single offensive word as to any creed represented in the House. It was his desire to arrive at a settlement by a process of give and take and conciliation—one which could be adopted without sacrifice of vital principles. With great heartiness he welcomed the speech of the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman said, in answer to a question of the Leader of the Opposition, that the Bill was one which could hardly be pressed if a strong feeling in opposition to it was developed. A little later the Prime Minister said that they should not take it that a complete settlement of the question could be arrived at. However, in the beginning of his last speech the right hon. Gentleman intimated that the Committee stage would not be a farce, but that reasoned Amendment would be considered. He thought that this was much more satisfactory than certain remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Bill, who said that they should not disturb the equilibrium of the settlement, or the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury who described it as a "balanced settlement." He also welcomed the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and of other hon. Members opposite. In fact, everybody seemed to be full of the spirit of peace and of a desire for a settlement of this long discussed question. That was his own feeling; but that must not prevent them from examining this question in a friendly spirit. He must say that the suddenness with which the present situation had come upon them and upon the country appalled him. He understood that the excuse of the Government was that this question was extraordinarily difficult and that they were bound to sacrifice something in order to solve it. It was right to point out that all the difficulties were not inherent in the question itself, nor was it solely due to the tyranny of the Opposition. He thought it must be admitted that the Government had had a great deal of trouble in the Education Department. There had been constant changes made. He was very glad to hear that his hon. friend the Member for Denbigh, in his speech the previous night, did not make the slightest criticism upon the permanent officials of the Department who had had such an amount of work thrown upon them. He was sure he would command the assent of everyone on the front bench when he said that no officials could do more to carry out all the wishes of the Government now in power than the permanent officials of the Department had done. A terrible burden had been cast upon them, especially in connection with the last settlement, as was shown by the published correspondence. With regard to the politicians, of course, they deserved, in a sense, all that was said about them, and he thought that all the changes that had been made were perfectly agreeable to those subjected to them. But he believed these changes must have interfered with the attempts to secure a settlement of the question. His right hon. friend the present Minister for Education had not had quite fair play. He had only been in that office a few months when he had to bring in this Bill, but, though so young, they all desired to acknowledge his great abilities. There had not only been a change in persons, but a change in principles. He had been astonished at a speech made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in April last. In that speech the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I met a bishop down in Wales the other day and he said to me: 'Cannot we settle this question?' and I said to him: 'Why, certainly.' And so the bishop brought some of his clergy and I brought some of my Nonconformist friends and there we would have settled everything, only some busybodies interfered."

He could not help asking himself when that conversation with the bishop took place? He remembered in 1902 the right hon. Gentleman shaking his finger at the present Leader of the Opposition, and warning him against going buccaneering with the bishops. He also remembered an occasion in 1906 when his right hon. friend tapped the box on the Table and shouted—

> "Clericism is the enemy."

And now he said, "What is the good of embittering the quarrel; cannot we get to business"? It might be said: "Why recall these things? The men who then carried the sword and heaved the bricks are now for peace." He fully agreed, but he only wanted to point out that such men did not always make very good conciliators. They were too violent at one stage and went too far in the other direction at the next. So, his right hon. friends might have gone too far in the settlement of this education question and given away vital principles, the loss of which those for whom they spoke would for ever regret. He wanted to look at this matter in a business-like way. Let them ask, What was the principle of the Bill? It was quite different from that of the last Bill. There was a talk of its carrying over the last Bill with a few Amendments but that was absurd. The last Bill contained six clauses printed on five pages; this Bill consisted of twelve clauses and covered ten pages of print. Therefore, it could not be called an Amendment of the old Bill. The principle of the Bill might be stated thus: to introduce sectarian teaching into council schools and to abolish the religious settlement of 1870. He need not take the two things separately because they were both the same. He wanted to say a word or two on behalf of the settlement of 1870. His right hon. friend the Member for Rushcliffe said that that was a splendid settlement and he exclaimed: "Look how successful it has been!" And then his argument was: "Let us sweep it away." That was not his feeling. If they had got hold of some principles that had stood the shocks of time and had brought much good to the nation for nearly forty years, they ought to hesitate before they swept them away. His right hon. friend talked as if Cowper-Temple teaching was to go on in future just as it was doing to-day. There might have been more accuracy in the statement. What was Cowper-Templeism? It was that no formula or catechism of any particular Church was to be taught in any board or council school. Now, was it not the object of this Bill that all these formulæ and catechisms were to be taught in the council schools? If they passed this Bill they destroyed the Cowper-Temple compromise. That compromise was a most remarkable one. He never looked into it without wondering at the wisdom of their predecessors. The first principle of the compromise, the law as it now stood, was that the State should not interfere in the religious teaching in the schools; that that should all be left to the local authority. The school inspectors were not to interfere with the religious teaching sanctioned by the local authority. No grant was to be paid for religious instruction. No question was to be asked by the school inspectors about religious teaching. And finally, no school was to suffer in any way if it did not give religious teaching. He spoke on this matter as one profoundly impressed with the importance of religious teaching in the schools. In 1906 they discussed this matter at great length, but no true facts were presented to the House with regard to what Cowper-Templeism really was. When the 1906 Bill was before the House of Lords that House ordered a Report to be published in regard to Cowper-Temple teaching, and two remarkable Blue-books on the subject were issued in 1907. He was sorry that there had never been a discussion in this House on that Report, which showed that of the 331 local education authorities into which this country was divided, all of them, with the exception of one and even that one subject to some qualification, stated that religious teaching was given in their schools. That was to say that Cowper-Temple teaching was given in the 7,000 council schools in the country, and only in sixty or seventy schools was it not given. Was it not remarkable that this provision, so free, without compulsion, should have secured such a wonderful result? What was it that their predecessors in this House trusted to in regard to religious teaching? They put their trust in the religious instincts of the English people; and that was the reason why religious teaching had spread so much through the schools all over the country. But in this Bill, instead of trusting to the religious instincts of the people and leaving them a free hand on the matter, instead of relying on the wisdom of the local authorities, they had, on the prompting of the bishops, made it secure that there should be denominational religious teaching for three-quarters of an hour twice a week. They had put the local authorities under two authorities—first under the State and then under the priests. He feared that they had made a great mistake. He was speaking from the standpoint of a purely Protestant country. He thought that his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo had a perfectly good case when he said that this system was no good to the Roman Catholics. His Church had proved that, because no Catholic School was ever transferred to the local authority, and some other system to meet the needs of the Catholics must be devised. As he said they had never examined these Blue-books, but there was a debate on them in the House of Lords, and the Archbishop of Canterbury declared that he had always held that Cowper-Temple teaching contained the backbone of Church teaching. If the Church had got the backbone of their teaching they ought to be satisfied with it. He thought his Nonconformist friends had been quite unfairly treated throughout this matter of Cowper-Temple teaching. It had been described as Nonconformist teaching, and it was always talked of as if the Nonconformists made no sacrifice in accepting it. That was an insult to the Nonconformists who had their creeds and formularies as well as other Churches. What, however, was the position of Nonconformists with regard to this matter? Their position was that they had obeyed the law, and carried out the compromise. Then they were asked to accept another compromise, and the inquiry was made what they had given up. They replied that they had given up the right to teach their creed for the sake of setting up a good system of education in the schools, and they asked the Church to follow their example. He thought the Church had hitherto got the best of it; and as we had got in this country one system which had had such a proud record, and which secured so much to everybody, they ought to hesitate before they swept it away. Let them look at the effect it would have upon schools if they did this. A short time ago there was not one Liberal on those benches who would not have agreed with everything he had said, but what startling change had come over them. In eloquent language the Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty said that if they took the course set up by the Bill they would create pandemonium. He did not wish to put it so high as that, but he said that they would create great confusion if religious teaching were introduced in this way. If hon. Members studied the Bill they would see that it bristled with dangers. The two mornings did not mean two mornings a week altogether, but two mornings a week for every child, so that this sort of teaching would go on every morning. Then it was imagined that only religions with creeds would be taught, but they might have Christian Science and atheism brought in, and they might have a dozen jarring sects struggling in the schools for the bodies and souls of the poor children. They were told that at this moment war was going on, and that they ought to make peace, but the war was among the politicians, and there was peace in the schools. In the Catholic schools of the country the children were not experiencing any difficulties with regard to religious instruction, and in the Church and council schools they were getting on very nicely, and they had a great deal to thank this Parliament for. It had passed a food Bill and measures for medical inspection and sanitation. They had done much, and the cause of education was not stopped, but they were making great progress, and he did not believe that there was anything in this Bill which would advance education one whit. What would the Government do by it? They would transfer the strife which was raging among politicians to the schools, and he did not want that to be done. They were grown-up people, and were accustomed to strife, and could carry it through with comparatively little damage to themselves. But if it was introduced into the schools it would do permanent injury to the young mind. They had no experience of this system in this country.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): The day industrial schools.

Mr. LOUGH said he did not allude to them; he was speaking of the ordinary elementary schools. In the ordinary elementary school, whether it was a Church school or a council school they had got only one system of religious teaching. There were 7,000 of these schools in which there were 3,000,000 children in attendance, and he thought the House ought to pause before it disturbed a system which had worked so long and so well. What would be the effect of the Bill if it passed? It was said that only extremists were against it, but that was not the case. He was not an extremist. He did not like to mention another matter, and yet he felt bound to bring it before this House. He did not think the financial provision of the Bill was satisfactory. This was part of the difficulty in which they were placed owing to the extraordinary hurry with which the Bill had been produced. He should like to ask this question: Would the council schools get the grant which was given to the contracted-out schools?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend will find the financial proposals of my predecessor were published on 26th February last, and they have been before the House ever since.

Mr. LOUGH was glad to have elicited that information. He believed, therefore, that the same grants would be given to the council schools as would be given to the contracting-out schools. If that was so it would go a great way to meet the difficulties. In London they suffered under the Education Bill by getting about 2s. less than they ought to receive, and if anything was done with regard to education grants something should be done to remove the inequalities in regard to London. The financial proposals of the Bill were of a very subtle character in another respect. He wanted the House to look at the character of these associations, which were distinctly bound up with the financial arrangements. They were told that the Roman Catholic Association might get an amount of £750,000, and that the Roman Catholics did not think that was sufficient; and perhaps they might be able to make out a case to that effect. But he wanted to see the position of the Church Association. This question had been discussed as if it were quite certain that all Church schools would be transferred to the local authorities, but there was not a word about transferring Church schools except the 5,000 schools in the single school areas, and although that was a great number there was no compulsory provision for transferring any other schools. These 5,000 schools had only 500,000 children, and there would still remain about a million and a half of other Church school children. If all those contracted out the Church Association might have an income of three or four millions. He thought it was a very serious question for this House to consider at the end of an Autumn session whether associations of this kind were to be set up, and given such large sums as those proposed by the Bill. The very forefront of the Bill said that all tests for teachers would be removed by it, but he was afraid that those tests although driven out in one place, were put back again in another. He could not see how the teacher could be asked to volunteer to give religious teaching without introducing in a subtle way the tests which were condemned in the first clause. A teacher would make an excellent reputation for himself by volunteering to give religious teaching, and a great many would ingratiate themselves with the authorities in that way with a view to promotion. These were a few of the difficulties which he saw, and which he had always seen, in any system of establishing a right of entry or interfering with the Cowper-Temple compromise. They were difficulties which he did not think the Government had fully considered. It was not enough for them to say: "Let us meet this in a spirit of conciliation; let us give up something, and the other side give up something, and all will be right." It did not follow in human affairs that all would be right, and he saw a subtle danger in the way in which the Government were going about this that appealed to him very strongly. If the President of the Board of Education had brought down a Bill, and said it was out of his own mind, and expressed the conviction that he had been brought to it by a long struggle as a politician in this country, he would have received that Bill with greater respect. He did not like these arrangements behind the back of Parliament. They had had two of them this year, and the effect of them was to reduce this House to a registering assembly and their free judgment was not exercised upon them. They were told by the Prime Minister that there was an equilibrium about this settlement, but what was the result of it? It meant that they were going to waste ten days more in Committee and do nothing. They were the legislative authority of this country and he did not know who gave the Archbishop of Canterbury a right to dictate to the Nonconformist majority of this House. He had a great respect for the Archbishop of Canterbury, and all other clergymen in their proper places, but when they came to make laws he said they had not been selected by the people for that purpose, whereas the Members of this House had been, and they ought to approach the making of the laws with every faculty that they could bring to bear upon the task and with perfect freedom. They ought to be asked to express their opinions with due regard to limitations as to length, and as he did not wish to break that excellent rule he would not continue his remarks further, except to say that he was in favour of conciliation ["Oh!"] Certainly he was, his whole record proved that. He was for conciliation and he had mentioned those points in a perfectly business way to his right hon. friend in charge of the Bill, and until the last moment when they might have to give a decision on the subject he would certainly give the Government the benefit of any doubts which he had in his mind, and if they could remove those doubts they should certainly have his support.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) expressed the opinion that no one on the Opposition side of the House, whether he approved or disapproved of this Bill, was insensible of the admirable spirit and intention of its authors. The Bill itself was in marked contrast to that which it displaced. The principle of the last Bill was that if you wanted religious freedom you must buy it at the cost of educational efficiency, and if you desired educational efficiency you must forfeit all claim to religious freedom. That could not be said of this Bill. On the whole it would be unfair to say that any large section of the community was to be penalised for its religious convictions. But there was one exception, and that was the intolerable position in which the Roman Catholics were placed. Those who desired, from the Church of England point of view, to come to a settlement could hardly do so without a sense of betrayal and dishonour resting upon them so long as something better was not done for the Roman Catholics, and he trusted that in Committee the case of the Roman Catholics would receive much more careful consideration. Many people, both in the House and outside, felt that this Bill inflicted so great an injustice on the Church of England that it would be impossible for members of that communion to accept it. He owned that some ominous remarks dropped on the previous night by the hon. Member for North West Norfolk seemed to portend mischief, and to raise the question which, after all, was the main question before the House—Was this intended to be a lasting settlement, a permanent peace, or merely a truce? He confessed that those remarks disquieted him, nor did the text of the Bill appear fully to embody the understandings arrived at in the published correspondence. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had that day done something to reassure them on that score. He had told the House that if it were maintained that the Bill did not give full effect to the agreement, he would give careful attention to such criticisms. Everyone was alive to the enormous sacrifices which the Bill entailed on both sides. On the side of the Church of England, whether they considered it from the point of view of the sacrifice of money or of cherished sentiments, the sacrifices were immense and incalculable. In the rural areas and country villages the Church gave up everything and gained nothing. If the country clergy looked at this Bill only from the point of view of their own schools he would not be surprised if they said that the terms were impossible to accept. The only grounds upon which they could be accepted were that there might be found in the Bill, as a whole, other compensating advantages which made these great sacrifices worth incurring. There were two novel features in the Bill, which he put down as gain from the Church of England point of view. One was that for the first time the rights of parents were here explicitly recognised to have that form of religious instruction which they desired given to their children. That had been the demand of the Church for years past, but it had never yet found expression in legislation. Hitherto, the parent had a right to say, "The child shall not learn this"; and so the parent might withdraw the child; but until now no right had been given him to say "the child shall learn that." This was a great and a positive gain. It was brought about mainly through the universal right of entry. It was said that these facilities were precarious and illusory; that an unfriendly Board of Education or a hostile local authority might defeat their purpose; that the plea might be put in that the administration and discipline of the school made it impossible either for a school teacher or a stranger to give special religious instruction. But the working of this Bill, as of so many other things in our social and political life, must depend on the goodwill of those who worked it. As for the words of the Bill, they could be so amended as to make the intention more clear than it was at present; for the rest it must be left to the local authorities, who throughout England had shown remarkable reasonableness and toleration, and had managed to work out a difficult Act with wonderful harmony. Anyhow he did not feel able to depreciate the right of entry as had been done by some of his friends both inside and outside the House. He regarded this as a great opportunity which had come within the reach of the Church of England, and had hitherto seemed unattainable. The value of that opportunity would depend on what the Church made of it. It would provide a test of the vitality of the Church and of the convictions of the parents. If the Church had sufficient organising power, and the parents sufficiently strong religious convictions, the right of entry would be the greatest boon ever conferred on the Church of England. It probably could not be worked merely through the teachers in the schools. He put aside the question of the head teacher for a moment, though in passing he would say that the one-sided liberty given to the head teacher was most inequitable. If he was to be allowed to refuse to give religious instruction, he ought also to be allowed to give it if he liked. He thought, however, that the Church would find it necessary not to call in mere amateur teachers but to bring in trained volunteers, and they would have to devote their energies to the training of such teachers.

The second gain was this. It was the intention of the Bill to secure that Christian teaching should be given on the demand of the parents in every school in England. It was no longer to depend on municipal contests or on the warfare of local factions, it was now to be a statutory right. That had been criticised as one of the blots of the Bill. To his mind it was one of its chief merits that it lifted religious teaching above municipal squabbles, and recognised the duty to give that teaching as something enjoined by the State. But this Christian teaching—a description disputed by some of his friends—would not be made effective merely by such provisions as that for the formation of a religious instruction committee. It would be necessary to provide religious inspection of that teaching; and there must also be a complete change of policy of the Department as regards the training colleges. There must be no more of that policy of harsh repression which had characterised the Education Department towards the training colleges during the last two years. He welcomed the signs which had already been given by the Minister of Education that there was to be a new departure in that respect. He would only say a passing word upon the question of undenominational or Cowper-Temple teaching. It was said that it henceforth received a preferential place in our educational system; also it was described as "a new creed," a "State religion." As regards preferential treatment, the Bill did not for the first time give it preferential treatment; that treatment had been given for many years. As regards the other objection, he could not persuade himself that Cowper-Templeism was a creed or in any strict sense an "ism" at all. He quite admitted that for the Roman Catholics it was a form of religious creed which it was impossible for them to accept. But to the great mass of English Churchmen it was the common basis of Christian teaching, the groundwork upon which the rest of the fabric was raised. Church membership might be superadded to that teaching. Church teaching could supplement it. If that were not so, how could English Churchmen so long have acquiesced in a majority of their children being taught this form of religion in the Council schools of England? That fact alone showed that in the mind of most members of the Church Cowper-Temple teaching was not the poisonous thing it was thought to be by some extreme denominalionalists. He frankly admitted that the unified denominational school, both educationally and from the point of view of religion, was far better than the other kind of school; yet the description often given of undenominational schools could not be sustained by anybody holding the moderate views of the Church of England.

But he would add another remark—it was a vital consideration—that the Church of England must look ahead—it must look to the future. In the course of the debate, figures had been quoted which showed that the Church schools were dwindling in number every year, many of them had been recently closed, the number of children attending them was steadily declining, while the number of children in the Council schools was steadily increasing. He had heard no answer from his friends who took the other view to this question: "What do you propose to do looking to the future? Your whole interest seems to be concentrated upon the Church children in Church schools. Have you no concern for that much larger number of Church children who are in the council schools, who in a very few years will form an enormous majority over the others?" There were many poor parishes in the suburbs of London and in all the great cities where there were no Church schools, and now for the first time the Church would get access to those Church children; it would have the right of entry which, if it were used well and wisely, might be in the end the salvation of the children. Further, the Church of England was the Church of the nation, and not the Church of a sect. Her first obligations were to the members of her own communion, but she had also duties to those outside that communion. Other denominations might regard their duties as discharged when they had provided for the needs of their own children. Not so the Church of England; she was the trustee of the religious life of the whole people, she must have regard for the spiritual interests of the nation as a whole. It was surely a matter of the first moment to the Church of England that the State should not be secular, but that religion should be recognised, as it was solemnly recognised in this Bill, as a concern of the State. He laid great stress upon the special duty the Church of England owed to those who were not only outside her own communion, but outside all the Churches. There was a mass of children in our great industrial centres whose parents were untouched by the organisation of any Church; and if a secular system, which many advocated, were established, who would be responsible for those children? What body was there, what organisation? There was no agency other than the State, and that form of religion which the State authorised. The Church of England, therefore, could not take a narrow or sectarian view. She could not get absolute equality in the sense in which that phrase was sometimes used. She must make some sacrifices, and provided that she could safeguard the principles for which her own schools existed, she might well consent to surrender her strict rights in order to fulfil larger duties. If the present settlement were rejected, then candidly he saw nothing before them but the secular solution. It seemed to him that they would be steering straight for the secularisation of the schools, and he could not wonder that those who desired that solution entered the passionate protest which they heard last night against the proposed compromise. It was not a matter for the Church of England only, but for all who cared for religious education, to avert such a result. He trusted that Church people would consider this matter not only from the point of view of their own schools, the surrender of which might be to them a grievous hardship, but that they take care that their allegiance to their own Church did not prevail over their allegiance to religion itself.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): My right hon. friend the Member for Islington stated with great truth that most of us who are supporting this Bill are practised fighters in the education field, and I am reminded that my first political pilgrimage with my right hon. friend the President, was in an autumn campaign denouncing the Bill of 1902. Probably most of us envy in some degree those who are still compelled to maintain an attitude of splendid irreconcilability. It has very many attractions. But also because we have fought so long we have been able fairly and correctly to measure the strength of the position of those who have hitherto been opposed to us. I think we are wise in coming to the conclusion that we cannot have peace except on terms. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London, speaking to-day, was emphatic in his opinion that we none of us approve this arrangement, and that we none of us support it on its intrinsic merits. Is that true? Is it the case? Most of us see in this Bill the acceptance of some of our cherished principles, though it is true that there are disagreeable concessions in it that we should very much like to avoid. For myself, I should be no party to arrangements whch did not in essentials give us those things for which I and my forbears have been working. To my mind this controversy has always hinged, more than upon anything else, on the question of the test of teachers. The first time that I hoped for accommodation in this controversy and the effectual ending of this long warfare, was in the spring of this year, when I listened in the House of Lords to the Archbishop of Canterbury speaking on the Bill of the Bishop of St. Asaph. He used these words, speaking on 30th March—

> "Then this Bill admits the principle of the freedom of the teacher as such from religious tests. That is the more difficult question, I think, of all the many difficult questions which arise in connection with our educational problem. I have myself all my life supported the principle of freedom from tests of all those who occupy public offices in the Civil Service, or in other similar public capacity. I think that it is accepted now by most people, and I confess I have come to admit it myself even for teachers in their professional capacity."

I came away from the House of Lords on that occasion with new hope after these observations of the Archbishop. I want to say a few words about this question to my hon. friends on this side of the House. This Bill intends to abolish tests for teachers and I think it does so. The criticism which requires most to be met from this side of the House is the allegation that we have incidentally reimposed tests for teachers by this Bill. I think that everyone will admit that in rate-aided schools at any rate, legal tests are going to be abolished for teachers. You cannot abolish tests absolutely, because you cannot prevent a bias in the minds of the selectors of the teachers. Some men do not know what religious liberty means, and until you get perfection of public opinion you cannot get perfect freedom from tests. It is alleged by some of my hon. friends that clergymen and other enthusiastic Churchmen will, in order to get the assistance of the assistant teachers in the public schools, practically impose a test upon them by letting it be known that when it comes to promotion they will have their suffrages. I am not prepared to say that there would be no danger of this occurring among small bodies of managers where there are clergymen who have a somewhat narrow view of their responsibilities. In this Bill we make an attempt to remove the appointment of teachers out of what from the educational point of view I regard as the unsatisfactory parochial atmosphere where local prejudice and the limited power of selection injures the chances of free choice. We propose that the local educational authorities shall henceforward appoint the teachers themselves, and when the time comes I am ready to argue that as a great and valuable education reform. Here the provision is inserted as being an absolute safeguard against any systematic use of the power of promotion in order to reward the teacher. Among the varieties of partisanship which you find on county councils and corporations religious fanaticism very rarely appears. Since 1902 the county councils and the corporations have very often with very great difficulty worked what many of their members regarded as a partial Act with singular impartiality. What I say now is that when all moderate men are determined to make this Act work, as they will be if it is passed, the last thing that any county council will do is to tolerate the appointment of its teachers by religious prejudice. I believe in the commonsense of the average Englishman, and I believe he will prevent the county councils being made the fighting ground for sects, for everybody, from the squire to the working-man, is thoroughly sick of this kind of thing. I think those teachers who take the view of my hon. friend the Member for Nottingham are singularly ill-advised in their attitude towards this Bill. As a matter of fact the teachers stand to gain more than anybody else by it. There are 5,000 schools now closed to half the teachers of the country which will certainly be open to their free competition under this Bill. It appears to me to be a somewhat short-sighted policy on the part of the teachers for the sake of an indefinite, exaggerated, and speculative mistrust of their average fellow-citizens to reject what is for them a great actual professional emancipation. I say that, as far as I am concerned, I believe many people on this side of the House holding Liberal principles are thoroughly satisfied by this Bill. We get freedom for teachers, and by the control of the schools coming into the hands of the local authorities passive resisters can now pay their rates with peace and honour. But we have to make concessions. I do not myself like the right of entry, and I do not think we should concede the right of entry except to get a far greater thing, namely, the public control of the schools and a non-sectarian system. I very much wish that the clergymen would leave the schools alone, and I am sorry they are not satisfied with the ordinary Cowper-Temple teaching. But it is a solid and undisputed fact that they are not satisfied with it. That may be regrettable from our point of view, but it is very easy to exaggerate the harm which the clergy or anybody else can do by coming into the public schools. There may be here and there a clergyman who will try to make himself a nuisance by interfering and proselytising. I do not think they will, but that is a possible danger. Again I say that I do not believe public opinion on the local education authorities will allow that to take place. I think this fear in the minds of those who suggest that if this Bill is passed everybody from the parson to the managers are going to be unreasonable is wrong. I think that is a grotesque view of my fellow-countrymen. The Bishop of Manchester has used some words in which he spoke of something like an epidemic of sentimentality passing over the country. What there is throughout the country is an atmosphere of conciliation and common-sense and if we pass this Bill by the New Year we shall be able to go down to our counties, where we shall find everybody in responsible positions anxious to consider all the foibles and difficulties of others, resolutely and determinedly ready to work the arrangements in the Bill. It is in that spirit of confidence in our fellow-countrymen that I should like to see members of the Church of England approaching these proposals. Naturally we do not expect all sections of the Church to approve of this Bill, but I think we may fairly ask that those who care primarily for the rights of parents to support us. Since 1870 they have never been in a position of ease or security. They have had a limited number of Church schools which have been maintained at great expense and with little advantage to the Church owing to the unpopularity of the system. Their children in the provided schools were unable to obtain on any terms the religious teaching which they thought they had a right to have. Until the Archbishop of Canterbury presented these possible terms to his Church they were as far away as ever from obtaining what they wanted. A diminishing proportion of the children of the country were able to get Church teaching, and they were always liable through turns of political fortune to lose even the opportunities which they had. By this Bill, if honestly and properly worked, parents will have the absolute right conceded to them of getting their special religious teaching. The greater part of the arguments which have come from the other side of the House, and from those who are not wholly against these arrangements, has been that the facilities which the Government are offering under this Bill are not real. The noble Lord the Member for Marylebone said that the facilities under this Bill were an excrescence which was likely to disappear. The hon. Member for Chichester said they were meant to be illusory, and even the hon. Member for the Oxford University had some doubts as to whether these facilities were really effective. Now let us be quite clear as to what the Government mean. First of all, this Bill is meant to be an honest settlement. The granting of those facilities is meant to be a real permission. They are meant to be as fair as possible, and they are meant to be an absolute right to the parent limited only by the minimum of precaution necessary to prevent educational chaos. You might have a condition of things where there was an application by so many denominations that the educational efficiency of the school would be impossible to maintain during the first three-quarters of an hour. When we produce the provisions by which the local education authority have the absolutely necessary administrative control over the management of facilities, we are turned upon and told that then the Church is to be at the mercy of the local education authority, who may squeeze the teaching out of the schools in detail if not in the gross. Again, look at the condition of the public mind. If this Bill were passed would moderate opinion allow the county council to do anything of the kind? The noble Lord the Member for Marylebone said the other day that if this Bill were carried you would have the various sections going into local politics in order to see that facilities were properly worked. The very last thing that the members of the county councils want is to have their bodies turned into cockpits of religious squabbles, and they will take very good care to work these facilities honestly and straightforwardly in order to avoid any such occurrences as that. If it should happen that there are one or two counties so perverse as to attempt to break up the national settlement we may rely upon the honesty of the President of the Board of Education doing his best to prevent it. I want to know why we should expect the granting of these facilities becoming a failure. A few years ago I was in Australia, in New South Wales, where they have a system like the settlement which the Government is now proposing in this Bill. There are in New South Wales State-aided schools, State-managed, no tests for teachers, and no dogmatic or polemical theology taught. General religious teaching is part of the normal course of instructions in all the schools of the Colony, but superadded are facilities which, with the exception of certain details, are almost exactly what the Government are now proposing. Provision is made for setting apart one hour each day during which the clergymen may give special instruction to those scholars of his own particular persuasion. As a matter of fact, the compromise we give is rather better, because they do not allow instruction by the assistant teacher. I made very careful inquiries, and I elicited that the privilege of giving special religious teaching was availed of by the Church of England and by that body alone. That was the system which had been working in New South Wales some ten or fifteen years, and there has been no case of friction recorded between the educational authorities and the Church in carrying out those facilities. In order that the House may see it was a real concession I should like to read from one of the Reports issued in the diocese of Sydney, where the Church displays a great activity, from the Rev. Arthur W. Payne, on special religious instruction—

> "A good record of work done during the past year can be given. It is impossible to furnish an absolutely complete statement, but there has been an increase in the number of clergy and catechists engaged in this work. Altogether at least 449 classes were taught, representing about 28,000 children. These are the highest figures yet reported."

This seems thoroughly satisfactory. I never heard anyone say there was any harm in it from the point of view of the Church. The Church was thoroughly satisfied. And on the other hand, when I was there, although I made many inquiries, I never heard any complaint on the part of other Protestant Churches of the use made by the Church of England of a privilege which was on their part deliberately neglected. I believe it might work in the same way here. Some hon. Gentleman opposite are alarmed because some of my friends on this side say there need be no fear in granting facilities because they will not last long; in ten years nobody will be utilising them. Of course, it is possible that at any rate in some parts of England the Church may prefer to restrict the denominational teaching to the Sunday schools. It may prefer to keep its money for other purposes than paying teachers to come in for denominational teaching. I am entirely disinclined to be prophetic myself. I do not know what is likely to happen. But even if that should happen it would not vitiate the arrangement from the point of view of the Church. They could always re-adopt the system if they pleased. I prefer to say, with the hon. Member for Oxford University, the right of entry will be whatever the Church chooses to make of it. None of us like contracting out. Some Churchmen want all schools that can be to be contracted out, and they are asking for a grant which is equivalent to the present rate aid. Obviously that would be no settlement at all. Clearly there are districts which are not covered by the single school area provisions, in which there are two or three denominational schools, as the case may be. If contracting out were allowed with enormous grants equivalent to rate aid, what would happen in those districts? All the Church schools would remain and costly public schools would have to be built for those children who did not want to go there. There would be from the point of view of a large number of people, no public gain, and a great deal of educational and financial loss. We are all agreed with regard to contracting-out, if contracting-out there must be, that it should be as limited as possible, because it is an educational evil, and where it is specially desired there must be some kind of readiness to contribute towards it. Last night we had a surprising speech from the hon. Member for North-West Manchester. He informed us that in the unfortunate parishes of Lancashire there are no subscribers. He did not appear to appreciate that even if that were true they could get assistance from the rich subscribers to their association in other parts of England. But really are we to believe that the Lancashire Churchmen are so determined to be outside the national system, and yet so unable to pay for the privilege? Surely there must be some exaggeration in the hon. Gentleman's figures. Either the Churchmen of Lancashire are not so anxious for their separate schools or else they are not quite so poor as he represents them to be. The Church can very well afford to pay for this exceptional privilege. In 1901 £640,000 were subscribed by the Church of England to these schools, and there is no reason why they should not pay a large proportion for the special privilege of standing outside the national system. Again, on the Roman Catholic aspect of the question, from an educational point of view, we regret contracting out, but the terms we offer cannot be regarded as ungenerous. In Australia they have systems which absolutely satisfy the whole of the Protestant part of the population. But what happens to the Catholics there? There is no money for Catholics at all. They are pariahs. The whole of the money has to be found by them—a terrible misfortune for the education and the progress of the country. We are being generous to those who choose to hold themselves out of our national system. I believe this Bill is the basis for some kind of settlement. I believe we are in it reverting to what might have been achieved in 1870 if the opportunity had been taken, a national system with the fewest possible exceptions instead of the exceptions being made the rule. I do not believe in 1870 the National Church need ever have been outside the national system. I do not believe it ever wanted to be outside the national system, but a bribe was offered it to stay outside, and no inducements were offered it to come inside. We, to-day, honestly offer terms to the Church to enter, and many of its wisest leaders are anxious to accept these terms if they can. I believe our country will be intensely angry with us if we reject this Bill. We shall be felt to represent neither the Churches nor the State. The mass of the electors want a settlement. They may be the less articulate part of the electors, but they are the more numerous, and in the end it will be found they are the more important.

*Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) quite agreed that some constituents might be angry if the Bill was rejected. But he was perfectly sure, even if the Bill was enacted, no considerable part of the people would be very enthusiastic about it. He wished to give his reasons for having decided to vote against the Second Reading. He had generally agreed that a Bill should secure Second Reading, and that there every privilege should be availed of to effect desired Amendments. But in regard to this Bill if he read the signs aright there would be no chance of emendation in Committee. They had to take the Bill as a whole. They would be able to make their speeches but the Government and the supporters of the Bill would be able when occasion required to rally their forces and outvote any arguments which might be adduced against any provision of the Bill. This seemed to be a grave violation of Parliamentary privilege. He entered an emphatic protest against these compromises being entered into and Bills being framed upon them simply with the idea that Parliament had the power only to ratify but neither to amend nor reject them. They had been plainly told by Ministers that the Bill was to be accepted as a whole, that if any portion of it was modified or tampered with, the balance would be disturbed and the whole arrangement would have been broken. He felt that that was an undesirable thing. The House of Commons was the representative body of the nation, and Bills ought to be passed through the House as the result of free expression of opinion and due consideration of the various points comprised in them. One wondered how far this system of conference and compromise was likely to proceed. Would they see a conference to consider whether it was possible to get a Licensing Bill through? He did not see why, if it was possible to bring two hitherto irreconcilable elements such as the bishops and Nonconformists together, it was not equally practicable to bring the brewing interest and the temperance reformer into co-operation. He would have no objection to a Licensing Bill going through, but he did not think it was practicable on these lines. He had never contemplated seeing Nonconformists accept a Bill containing such startling provisions as this. During the general election, although in the whole of his public career he had been convinced that the only abiding and natural solution of the question was the secular solution, his sympathies were Nonconformist, and he had pledged himself in his constituency to see redress for the undoubted grievances that Nonconformists laboured under. But if this was the way in which Nonconformist grievances were to be remedied he could not read the terms aright. In this compromise they seemed to think that the nation was composed entirely of Churchmen and Nonconformists. There was a considerable proportion of people who perfectly honestly rejected all creeds. He had never heard previously that the rejecttion of creeds invalidated the rights of citizenship, and he could not see how the rights of this considerable portion of people were properly preserved in this Bill. True the conscience clause was retained, but there was no man with a proper respect for his children who liked them to be marked as heretical in the schools. They had a strong objection to the children being called upon to bear the whole responsibility for the idiosyncrasies of their parents, and he felt that even the retention of this so-called conscience clause did not compensate for the abrogation of the rights of a considerable class of people, many of whom he was acquainted with as being good citizens and equally worthy of consideration with any sects who were parties to this compromise. They had been told repeatedly that if this Bill was not accepted the only alternative was the secular solution. Others said that that would never be accepted by the nation as a whole, but he was convinced that more and more people were coming to recognise that it was the only enduring solution of this vexed question. Undoubtedly in the realm of sectarianism the non-combatants were diminishing. More people were becoming convinced of the desirability of the State confining itself to the imparting of what was known as secular instruction. Another portion of the people were so sick and weary of this sectarian bitterness that they had turned to the secular solution, some said as a policy of despair, because they desired to put an end to this question. The Government ought to accord more credit to those who had advocated the secular solution. If it had not been for the spread of that idea he did not think the bishops and Nonconformists would ever have come together in this matter. The Archbishop of Canterbury had referred to "the gaunt spectre of secular education." He felt his Grace had become convinced that some sort of settlement ought to be arrived at, otherwise the nation would, as a whole, embrace the idea to which he had referred. It was proposed by subsection (*b*) of Clause 1 of this Bill that Cowper-Templeism was for the first time to become a statutory part of our national education. He regarded that as a most undesirable departure from the State point of view. Although Churchmen and Nonconformists might have succeeded for the time being in coming to an arrangement on this matter he believed they would find that they were opening up fresh difficulties, and that strong resentment would be manifested against this new provision. Hitherto they had had a more or less correct idea of what was meant by Cowper-Templeism, but did the provision in Clause 7 mean that a committee of religious bodies was to decide about the syllabuses which were to prevail in the public schools? Were they to have a free hand in compiling the syllabuses? Was it to be that according to the composition of the committee the syllabus was to have a delicate denominational tinge in one district, and a vividly coloured denominational tinge in another? He saw a grave danger that Cowper-Templeism as they had understood it in the past might be a pronounced form of denominationalism. If the local education authorities were to have power to appoint the special committees these committees could compile the syllabuses which would satisfy the whole of their denominational demands. He hoped that his fear on this point was unfounded, and that the Government would be able to assure him that no such power was contemplated. He was, for a number of years, connected with the school board of his own district, and, whatever might have been his speculative difficulties, he had always sided with his Nonconformist friends in protesting against the right of entry into the national schools. Until this Bill was sprung upon them he did not think that certain members of the Cabinet would ever have allowed such a principle to be embodied in a measure brought forward by a Liberal Government. He was convinced that the Government were placing them on the slippery slope of denominationalism. He felt sure that they would ultimately be convinced of the truth of the statement which had been constantly made that there was no logical halting place between the exclusion of all religions and the inclusion of all denominations in our educational system. The hon. Member for Louth, speaking on the Second Reading of the 1906 Bill, stated that he had a strong objection to the right of entry to public schools being conceded to the clergymen of every Church, because the Church of England was approximating more and more to Roman Catholicism. The attitude of some undenominationalists on the benches opposite was somewhat remarkable; he never conceived that it would have been possible, but there they had it. The teachers were still as strenuously opposed to this as ever. Their desire was to promote education, and, therefore, they were not prepared to temporise with this arrangement at all. The teachers ought to know what sort of supervision would be exercised by those who were to have the right of entry into the schools. Were those who entered to be allowed to impart anything they liked? He had seen a letter from a Nonconformist who sent his children to a particular school as a matter of convenience. The children on returning from school one day stated that they had been told that unbaptised children could never enter the kingdom of heaven. It seemed to him that under the proposals contained in the Bill they were laying their children open to that kind of teaching. He could conceive that some children might be penned off in one class-room to receive such teaching, while others in another class-room might be taught something entirely different. It was undesirable that such conflicting ideas should be imparted to children attending the same school. Did the Government desire to see a system of fee paying growing up in the schools? He could not understand the meaning of the provision with respect to that matter. He hoped that no provision would be put in any Act of Parliament to encourage the establishment of schools on the fee-paying principle. He presumed there was a desire in some quarters to have a sort of class schools established, because some parents were able and willing to pay fees. That provision would have to be closely watched in Committee, and, if necessary, excised from the Bill. As to teachers being allowed to give religious instruction, he thought the hon. Member for North Camberwell put it in a rather paradoxical way last night when he said that the teachers would be asked to volunteer. A teacher might be asked to volunteer by a member of the authority by whom he was engaged. That would simply mean that the teacher's economic dependence would not allow him to refuse. If a local education authority desired that a certain kind of religious instruction should be given and a teacher refused to give it, the refusal would militate against the teacher's chance of promotion. Therefore, teachers did not want to be placed in that position. All educationists were opposed to the principle of contracting-out. There had not been an argument adduced that day in favour of it. It meant that public control over contracted-out schools would be lost, and it necessarily followed that the standard of education would be depreciated in those schools. Under the system of contracting-out, the management of the schools would become largely clerical, and he was afraid it would become loose and inefficient. Further, the teachers would always be liable to have extraneous duties laid upon them. Very often they would be selected, not because they were able to impart certain secular knowledge, but because they were willing to perform duties which did not come within their functions. He and his friends who shared his views had a genuine complaint against this Bill. He never offered vexatious opposition to any measure. He would prefer in this case, if it were possible, to exercise restraint in order that the Bill might be passed, and the path cleared for the tackling of other social reforms. He was convinced that this Bill would afford no permanent solution of the question. He had heard Nonconformists say that they did not believe that the right of entry would be readily used. It was because he thought it would be largely used, and that it would be detrimental to the development of a national system of education that he objected to the Bill. They should look at this matter from the standpoint of the children. If they did so they would appreciate the futility of teaching these sectarian formulæ to the children. He did not believe that the children could grasp these sectarian subtleties. They accepted them because they were told to do so, but when they grew up, if the teaching on these matters remained with them at all, they accepted it instinctively, not as the result of reason and reflection. He believed that in all spheres of thought their conclusions ought to be arrived at from study and reflection. For his own part, he wanted to see the children given as full an education as it was possible for them to acquire, so that when they arrived at maturity they would be able to judge these religious matters for themselves. They would then be in a position to determine for themselves whether these formulæ were incongruous or wise on the whole. He did not believe that sectarian teaching had improved the character of the people of this country. Religion did not consist in an intellectual assent to theological propositions. Religion was a thing they could not explain and could not put into the clauses of a Bill. It was something to believe, and he insisted that to allow clergymen into a school for a certain period two or three days in the week was not to promote a true idea of religion as he had been able to apprehend it. He agreed with other hon. Members that it was time this religious difficulty in the schools was got out of the way. He felt that they could do more to promote genuine educational progress by putting aside religious and sectarian controversies, and by extending the school age of the children, reducing the number of children in the classes, improving the qualifications of the teachers, and making it easier for the children to pass from the elementary to the higher forms of education. These things would never be possible until they put this religious controversy outside the field of educational affairs. He was convinced that this Bill would not effect that desirable consummation, but would do something to accentuate the existing evils. He believed that sectarian issues would be imported into Parliamentary elections, and it was evident from his speech that day, that the Leader of the Opposition would not let this question die. The right hon. Gentleman had practically said that if he was in power again he would be met with a demand for the extension of the privileges given in this Bill to the denominations, and he admitted the possibility of his party acceding to the demands of the denominationalists and placing denominationalism completely on the public funds. Municipal squabbles would arise over the question; Parliamentary issues would be obscured by sectarian conflict, and progress would be arrested. The duty of the State was to educate the children only in that which was common to all. This country did not consist alone of Churchmen or Nonconformists. There were other sections that had to be considered; and he very respectfully submitted that, however objectionable the idea of secular education might be to some people, it was the only practical solution of this vexed question. He apologised for the length of time he had taken, but he wanted to make perfectly clear the conscientious reasons which he held for voting against the Second Reading of the Bill.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he wished to give his reasons for voting for the Second Reading of this Bill. It was no ordinary Bill, and it had to be considered in its relation to the circumstances in which the measure had been brought in and the intentions with which it had been introduced. The objections he had to the Bill, though very great, were all clause objections, which might well be argued and enforced in the Committee stage and finally given effect to by a protest on the Third Reading. His inclination to support the Bill on the Second Reading had received some disturbance since the beginning of the debate. There were two causes of disquietude. The hon. Member for North-West Norfolk, who occupied a position of a rather representative character in this matter, had used the strange expression that this Bill was what he called an instalment. He would not be doing his duty if he did not draw attention to the use of that word. Again, the Prime Minister had said that this Bill was to be taken "as a whole," and the right hon. Gentleman had also used the expression that to make any material alteration in the Bill would be to "disturb its balance." He quite recognised that; but he was entitled to ask whether that meant merely that they were not to move for concessions of a substantial and material kind, or whether it meant that they were not to ask that concessions which some of them believed to be only apparent, should be converted in the course of the Committee stage into real concessions? Churchmen and the trustees and owners of Church schools were being asked to part with something which they could never regain. Vendors of land did not usually part with the possession of their land until the cash or specie was laid on the table. In this case the Church was asked to part with its schools for something which could easily be taken back again, or could be made altogether nugatory, as regarded its value. He did not wish to impute want of faith, or anything of that kind. Bills were not usually framed on the understanding that the whole population was going to enter into a conspiracy to defeat them when passed into law; but on this Bill they were justified in proceeding with the utmost possible caution, and were not entitled to proceed on the most optimistic assumptions. He did not wish to mention names or to give currency to phrases used in the course of private conversation, but rumours had reached him and his friends, which showed that there had been no abatement on the part of certain local authorities of their hostility to Church schools. Was there any person on the benches opposite who could give, and was entitled to give—was there any leader of thought and opinion in or out of the House, who was prepared to give assurances that local authorities were prepared to change their conduct in relation to Church schools on advice from headquarters? If such assurances could be given they would go far to remove the objection which many on that side of the House had to voting for the Second Reading. He wished to enter the caveat that in voting for the Second Reading, he detached himself from approval of the actual provisions of the Bill. His vote for the Second Reading meant no more than that he wished to keep alive beyond that night the possibility of a settlement, because he felt that to close the door that night was to close it much too soon, and he did not wish to make impossible the carrying of Amendments which might make the Bill an equitable and a durable settlement.

*Sir ROBERT PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) did not think that any Nonconformist in this House, or in the country either, could or would express much enthusiasm about this Bill, and he greatly doubted whether it was in accordance with many of the election pledges which they gave prior to the last election. He ventured to dissent from the view expressed by the Minister for Education when he said that in its main features it really carried out the principles which they had been for many years contending for. Indeed, if some of them had gone to their constituencies three years ago and told them that they proposed to throw open the portals of the old school board schools, now the council schools, to the incursions of the clergy of every sect for the purpose of teaching their doctrinal theory, and if they had told them that they intended to extend the principle of contracting-out, and been asked to support such educational measures, the only answer, he thought, that they could have given them would have been: "Is thy servant a dog to do this?" None of them ever contemplated the remotest possibility of having to stand up in the House, and give even a measured degree of approval to a Bill of this description. His right hon. friend the Minister for Education was, he knew, familiar with the past history of Nonconformity in this country, and it seemed to him that history was strangely repeating itself in connection with this measure. He turned up last night a passage from a letter written by Lord Ripon to Mr. Forster in 1870, in which he stated the difficulty in which he found himself placed in forcing through the House a Bill which undoubtedly proved, as they had been told that afternoon, fairly satisfactory for many years, and which was sometimes called a settlement. Mr. Forster, as they all remembered, was brought to task, as he had no doubt the present Government would be, by many people throughout the country for being a party to a concession which was then considered educationally unsound and conflicting absolutely with the principles of religious equality and the teachings of Nonconformity. Lord Ripon replying to Mr. Forster said—

> "Your business and mine is simply to try and get the Bill through without alteration. If Gladstone prefers to carry it by the aid of the Tory rather than by consulting the bulk of the Liberals, that is his affair not ours, and we must let him do what he likes on that point."

That was the view of what possibly some people might call a practical politician, and others would call a political opportunist. At all events, the result of the action was that the Government of the day was deserted by many of its most active supporters throughout the country, and the Liberal Party in 1874 was beaten hopelessly at the polls. The Government unquestionably must have had all these facts before them when they entered upon these negotiations, to which such frequent reference had been made in the House and in the Press. He would like to say that he spoke on behalf of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, which was the largest in this country next to the Church of England, and when he said that no negotiations of any sort whatever had taken place between the Government and the educational authorities of that Church in connection with this Bill, prior to its introduction. They knew absolutely nothing about it officially. He did not think, with one or two exceptions possibly, that any of their leading ministers or laymen were consulted, and therefore they were in precisely the same position as the Roman Catholic Church. The Wesleyan Methodist Church were in absolutely the same position. As representing a village constituency, he would confine his remarks for the moment to the rural districts, and he would ask whether in the rural parts of this country they were going to gain or lose educationally by this Bill. It certainly seemed to him that the Bill for rural districts had three very distinct advantages, coupled, as it now stood, with two serious drawbacks. In the first place, the parson ceased to be the ruler of the school, and the sectarian majority on the management committee for the first time disappeared. The school, therefore, became a public school under the management of the local education authority, and that was unquestionably a great advantage, because it brought 6,000 single area schools in the country within the purview for the first time of a national system of educational control. He ventured to point out that this was not an effective control unless this Bill, or some future Bill, was going a step further, and provide for very much smaller educational areas of management. Those who were familiar with the rural districts knew that in many counties—let them take Lincolnshire as an illustration, there they had a great Nonconformist county, and its representation at present showed it to be a preponderating Liberal county, and yet the district and county educational authorities were, unhappily, through the smash-up of the school board system, now Anglican and

Tory, and failed altogether to represent either the political or religious complexion of the county. Consequently, unless they restored, and very quickly restored, the local educational authorities in small areas, they would not have the advantage of the educational assistance and supervision of the men in the locality. It was illusory altogether to suppose that this Bill gave effective local control over their schools, and the point taken by the hon. Member below the gangway who spoke a few minutes before with reference to Clause 7, was a very practical one in such a county as Lincoln, because there it would be possible, under Clause 7, which he should very much like to see excised from the Bill, for the Lincolnshire County Council, and many other county councils, to provide a small sectarian committee for the purpose of formulating the religious curriculum to be used in public schools, this being Cowper-Templeism. But there was no doubt in these districts it was a great advantage to get rid of the parson who controlled the school and to make it into a public school, and place 6,000 schools under the national system. In the next place, the Bill undoubtedly emancipated in those districts the teacher from clerical control, and he became for the first time a free man, not appointed by managers of sectarian schools, whether they were Anglican, Wesleyan, or British, but he was appointed regardless of sectarian qualifications by the central educational power. That was a great step forward in the English village and the small town, because it threw open for the first time, he thought he was not wrong in saying, some 10,000 or 12,000 places for head teachers and assistant teachers to the Nonconformist boy or girl. That was the second great advantage of this Bill in the rural district. The hon. Member who spoke last but one, he thought, spoke quite correctly when he said that possibly this Bill found them in a position of readiness to accept it, owing to the spectre of secularism in the distance—in the near distance. The paramount reason, however, was that they believed that religious or irreligious conflict was hostile to educational efficiency and progress. In the next place he believed that most of them were anxious for a settlement, because there was no doubt that the controversies of the last few years had thrown into hostile camps many men who were anxious to work together for religious, social, and moral reform. But there was no doubt there was a third reason which governed many men, and that was to keep away from the young life of the country an educational system without the teaching of the Holy Scriptures in schools. Therefore while he would prefer to leave the local authorities the powers which they enjoyed under the Act of 1870 to decide for themselves whether they would have Bible teaching in the schools or not, whether they would have Cowper-Temple instruction or not, yet he was so anxious to base the education of the country upon the moral law derived directly from the reading and the teaching of the Holy Scriptures that he was prepared to give up his views in that respect and consent to a statutory obligation on local authorities to provide for Cowper-Temple instruction as a normal condition in all the State-controlled schools. Those were the three advantages of this Bill, but they were face to face with the right of entry and "contracting-out." He unhesitatingly said that he did not believe that the right of entry would be used for many years to come. He did not believe the right of entry would be used for many years, because what the people of this country desired for their children was simple Bible teaching, given by the teacher, and not by a cleric of any denomination. What was the position of the teacher who might offer to give this teaching? In the first place, he might, and probably would, give plain Bible teaching. He would then be called on by the parents to give sectarian religious instruction. He would receive no payment for it, and he would have to plunge into Biblical studies about which he had hitherto not troubled himself. The importation of the clerical teacher to impart to the children the theory of transubstantiation and other doctrines would reduce the schools to a state of pandemonium if long continued. While he believed that contracting-out was bad educationally, bad for the children and the teachers alike, one could not fail to see that the trend of educational life in this country was wholly in the direction of council schools under public control. Balancing the advantages of the Bill against its disadvantages, and believing that the right of entry and contracting-out were conditions not destined to very long continuance, he came to the conclusion that his duty, much as he disliked it, was to make the best of a bad job. He hoped the President of the Board of Education would not under-rate the depth of feeling which existed among Nonconformists in regard to the Bill. His right hon. friend had spoken lightly and flippantly about the views of an eminent Nonconformist, the Rev. Hirst Hollowell. That gentleman was supposed to represent the extremists, but where would the Liberal Party be but for the extremists ? Their battles were won by men who were called fanatics, enthusiasts, and extremists. To under-rate men of that sort would be to strike a fatal blow at Liberalism for years to come. Much as he disliked the compromise, it contained elements of advantage, and, taking a debtor and creditor account, he thought the balance came down a very little way in favour of the Bill.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said the Prime Minister, in speaking about contracting-out, had stated that the figures of the schedules would be the subject of discussion at a later stage. Of that the House would take due note, but if the guillotine was going to fall on the Bill the time given for that discussion would be very short. In the Scottish Education Bill discussion recently it took three hours to wring from the Secretary for Scotland an admission which they had been trying to get for a long time, and, therefore, he hoped in this Bill the right hon. Gentleman would see that there was full time given for discussing the figures of the schedules. Contracting-out was not the special privilege which it was supposed to be, in so far as it enabled those who supported voluntary schools to stand aloof from the national system. On the contrary it was the Government who forced the supporters of voluntary schools out. The Catholic authorities had not been consulted, and it was not a proper use of language to speak of a privilege being presented to the Roman Catholics and other voluntary school supporters in suggesting that they could contract out. He would use the analogy of the Parliamentary Secretary, with regard to the Roman Catholic schools of Australia getting no grant from the Government, for his own argument. That was certainly a great hardship, but even if they got no support from Government funds they were able in spite of that to maintain their schools in a high state of efficiency. With regard to the statement of the Parliamentary Secretary yesterday that the Roman Catholic schools of Scotland were maintained at 40s., and that the Roman Catholics had made an extra claim of 10s., bringing it up to 50s., which was the exact amount that had been put in this Bill, he would say that as regarded Scotland, they were not asking for the utmost that they were entitled to. If they asked for full justice they would ask for 25s. and not for 10s. The Scottish parallel was not a sound one ; a second parallel to that of Scotland could be brought. In the White Paper issued that day the voluntary and council schools were all lumped together and the average struck for the county, but if all the voluntary schools were taken out, and then the average of the council schools struck, the average, instead of being 64s. 10d., as it was now, would be 94s. 10d. for all children attending the voluntary schools. The fact that they made a moderate claim in connection with the Scottish Education Bill was brought against them, but he feared that if these figures were not looked into it might be that the cost of the council schools in England would be brought into juxtaposition with the cost of the Catholic schools and rate-aided schools in Scotland. It had been said by more than one Member on the opposite side of the House, notably the present Secretary to the Admiralty, that the Members of the Irish Party on a previous occasion had voted for contracting-out. That was not the case. All they ever did was, as a last resort, and in order to save a certain number of schools, to vote only in respect of those schools which were not taken over by the local education authority in order to evade granting the facilities which were provided in Clause 4 of the Bill of the present Chief Secretary. In that sense only had they voted for contracting-out, and in no sense could it be said that the Members of the Irish Party had ever voted in favour of the principle of contracting-out. He wished to put that on record now, not, he was afraid, for the last time, because the memory of the House was proverbially short. Unless satisfactory proposals were made for contracting-out, either on the figures adduced or on the merits, he hoped that they were opposed to contracting-out; and he was sure that the President of the Board of Education, who was present, would bear that in mind when he came to deal with the matter in the Committee stage.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) said he was anxious to say a few words in support of the Second Reading of this Bill. He did so with no light heart. He approached the subject in the same spirit as the hon. Member for Louth. He did not often agree with him, but he thought that on the present occasion what they had to do was to make the best of a bad job. It was with regret that he thought this should be necessary. It would cause great heart burnings to many of those who had given their life and substance to the work of education for years past. He was afraid that it would not tend to educational efficiency and that it would impose very heavy burdens on the Exchequer already greatly pledged. Yet they were bound to face the situation in spite of the lurid prophecies of hi right hon. friend the Member for Islington, who was speaking of the old experience which they both had of the Act of 1870, and of the most grievous influence of the change which was to be wrought. But he thought that a Bill conceived in a spirit of conciliation and compromise, and regard for the feelings of opponents, must commend itself to them, and ensure from them very respectful attention. Their object must be to make the Bill workable and fair, and, if possible, not to leave the sting of cruel injustice and wrong in those who were called upon to make concessions. It was very painful to listen to the pitiful appeals of friends and supporters who said: "Why not leave this alone? We have in time past done our duty to the children; we have made sacrifices and efforts. When the State cared nothing about the education of the children, they have been our care, until gradually as time went on, and the educational demands of the country caused competition to arise, we were ready to allow the use of our schools. We accepted as a matter of obligation rate aid, and we admitted public control into the management of our schools." With the acceptance of rate aid, which no doubt was a necessity, an unfortunate necessity for the Church, fresh complications and fresh interests were brought in which could not possibly be disregarded. This Bill had received very strong opposition from Lancashire. He remembered it was to Lancashire that they owed the fact that they entered on the slippery path of rate aid, and he was not at all anxious now to follow the lead of Lancashire in this matter. Those who were opposed to the present proposals, wrote in despair saying, with truth, that they had fought the battle of purity and morality against a mass of indifference and wickedness, and that if they took away from them the care of the children they were depriving them of one of the chief instruments of maintaining true religion and honesty in the country. Yet if they ousted the parson, of which the hon. Member for Louth spoke with some satisfaction, and put in his place a teacher of whose qualifications to give religious teaching they were in ignorance, they would be doing a very doubtful service. In spite of his hon. friend's rejoicing over the total abolition of tests, he hoped that they would hear sooner or later that there was to be some guarantee that those who were appointed to teach religion had some qualifications for it and some interest in it. His hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary, who was the son of a very old friend and schoolfellow, and who, he was rejoiced to see, was coming well to the front, had spoken of how this very serious difficulty was to be met. He would ask his hon. friend to admit that there was another side to the question, and to listen to the counterplea of those who considered themselves outraged by anything that interfered in the least degree with absolute religious equality. He would also ask hon. Gentlemen to consider what they seemed to have forgotten, that a very emphatic verdict was given by the country three years ago on this education question. Having made this question one of the special planks of the Unionist platform, the country had most emphatically declared against taking schools out of public control and against tests for teachers. It was idle to suppose, as he thought their hon. friends were supposing, that that verdict could be ignored or forgotten. Two Bills had been introduced, and their failure had induced people to try to let things go on as they were. There had been delay in carrying out what he could not help thinking was a clear mandate from the country, and it was idle to suppose that the State in these days would not be supreme in the schools which it provided, and of which it paid the whole cost. He would ask them to remember that though this measure did affect them very strongly, yet there were points which compensated them to some degree for the losses which they had sustained, and the Bill went further in the direction of justice than anything which had yet been proposed. It gave opportunity for Church teaching in many schools from which it had hitherto been excluded. Whether it would be a lasting settlement, as had been well said on those benches, again and again, must depend on the way in which the Church rose to her new opportunities and undertook the responsibilities which would be cast upon her if this Bill became law. He trusted also that consultation committees in conjunction with the local authorities would result in securing that Cowper-Temple teaching should be definite religious teaching based on the Holy Scriptures, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostle's Creed, and the Ten Commandments, which could not be said to be distinctive of any denomination. Everything depended on that. If they succeeded in securing that, he agreed with his hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University that it should be called fundamental teaching rather than denominational teaching. It was the teaching of the Prayer Book, and the teaching of the baptismal service; the children were to be brought up in the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed. It did not go to the higher and more difficult portions of Church teaching. The children were to be first fed on pudding, and after a time they would come to meat which was the real basis, and was suited to stronger tastes. It was because the Bill held out a hope of this teaching being enforced in every school by those who were competent to give the teaching that he should give his support to the Second Reading. It was very easy to talk about inequality, and to say that no Bill could ever be satisfactory except that which gave perfect equality to all sects and denominations. He understood that the demand was that the State out of the rates or taxes should provide separate religious teaching for all the different denominations. It was because he thought that was an absolute impossibility that he put aside that very specious plea for absolute equality of treatment. It was true that in Germany and Switzerland there was denominational teaching given by the State, but the circumstances of those countries were very different from ours. They were roughly divided into Catholics and Protestants and certain districts were Catholic and certain were Protestant. They were not mixed up as they were among us with not merely two divisions, but probably five or six or more. Therefore he could not admit that there was any precedent in that matter. They had also to look at the question in the face of what was spoken of as injustice to the Church, and he thought it would be a gross injustice to the Church if she was forced to give up her buildings for inadequate consideration. They had had figures put before them which seemed to show that there was a fair case for reconsideration of these figures when the time came, and he also hoped the grievance under that head would be removed. There was another grievance very prominently put forward, that the Church had to pay for teaching of which it disapproved, and again for the teaching of its own faith. If they admitted, as he had been contending, that they could not disapprove of fundamental teaching based on the simple Christian faith, there was no injustice in their being called upon to pay for that, and to pay specially for further doctrines. His own strong feeling was that if they went for this question of absolute equality it was only to be had by the adoption of the secular system, and it was because the Bill pointed a way of averting that — it might not be the best way and it might not have the success that was hoped for it, but it was a fair and honest attempt to settle the religious question and to keep the schools of the country religious—that he supported the Second Reading.

*MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) said he thought the speech to which they had just listened would not only command great weight from the character of the right hon. Gentleman, but from the temper and spirit in which it was addressed to a position of unusual gravity and of no little doubt and difficulty. He was quite sure that in so unusual a position, one might well avoid the temptation into which a few Members had fallen of treating the highly vulnerable parts of this proposed settlement with the rhetoric and invective which might be so easily launched against it when they were asked to consider proposals brought forward by the Government in accord with the vast mass of moderate opinion and at the same time in grave difference from previous proposals. It was perfectly obvious that those who in past years had taken any active part in the educational controversy must find many things in these proposals which they not only regretted, but to which they were vehemently opposed. Yet if they allowed themselves to deal with these proposals in a spirit of controversy they knew they would find themselves not merely where they were before the Bill was introduced, but really in a worse position. If this settlement failed, it was not merely that those who in any way supported it would have their flank turned by opponents from their own side, but the failure of the settlement would undoubtedly conduce to embitter this controversy more than ever and to bring a feeling of despair to the minds of all who felt that some working settlement was essential, it the educational progress of the country was to be carried on. They had been asked to consider whether this compromise was likely to make a permanent settlement, and for that purpose they were bound to scrutinise carefully the provisions of the Bill and to ask themselves whether they really carried out this compromise. As he understood, here was a proposal in the first place to have publicly controlled schools in every part of the country. That was a proposal for which, upon grounds apart from religious controversy, educationalists had for years been looking forward. Even those who on grounds of highest conscience had maintained with ardour existing non-provided schools in rural districts had often in moments of candour admitted that that involved grave administrative difficulties. Accordingly to those who came to the consideration of this Bill from the point of view of practical administration and from the civic point of view, first of all, the main principle of the Bill, that there should be a popularly managed school within the reach of every child in all parts of the country, was so great an educational step in advance that it might well make them anxious to go as far as possible in other directions of concession, if only that could be secured. The other part of the compromise, as he understood it, was that there should be in all the schools thus popularly managed, facilities for special religious teaching. They would have to ask themselves in Committee whether these facilities were on the one hand genuine and adequate, and on the other hand fully guarded against the character of the school being changed by means of them. When they heard in one part of the House a forecast that these facilities would be of no value, and from the other side a forecast that they would be used so extensively as to undermine the national system, they were bound in the interests of a permanent settlement to see how far they could secure that parents who really spontaneously wanted those facilities for their children should have them, and at the same time secure that no pressure should be put on the teacher, that no unneedful disorganisation should come upon the school, and that it should not be made easy for persons to proselytise by these opportunities. It would be very desirable if the regulations governing these facilities could be embodied in the Act itself, because from whatever point of view they approached this settlement they were most anxious that there should be as little ambiguity as possible. He hoped the Minister for Education would consider whether it was not possible for Parliament to know, before it passed the Bill, exactly what regulations were intended in order to see that those facilities were genuine and yet guarded against all abuse. In the next place he thought that if those were the principles of the Bill—and they considered that the principle of having a school of a public type within the reach of every child was the main principle of the Bill—and if facilities were only to be given to persons who genuinely desired them, and given in a way which, in one sense, was subordinate to the normal life of the school, but in an equally true sense was specially adapted to special needs—if those principles commended themselves to the House, then they were free to consider how far the carrying-out of those methods did or did not conflict with those religious ideals which on their better side had done so much to elevate education, and on their worse had done so much to embitter it. He hoped the House would not attach too much importance to the grave though perfectly honest fears expressed by Members on both sides of the House. After all, the agreement on religious matters which had been come to by most of the trusted leaders of Nonconformity on the one side and was obtaining the support of the bishops of the Anglican Church on the other, was an agreement in which neither religious community was entitled to say it had been sold or given away. It was quite inconceivable that on the purely religious aspect of this problem those who had great authority and knowledge and had devoted their lives to the religious aspect of their affairs were going to agree upon something which in their judgment really involved a sacrifice which it was not conscientious to make. He agreed that it was not for theologians or divines to lay down principles of educational administration. Therefore he based his guarded and anxious support of this Bill on the ground, first of all, that the administrative principles it laid down appeared to be on the whole worth supporting; and in the second place, because the religious aspects of the question had apparently been harmoniously arranged, and that fact was entitled to carry the very greatest weight. He very rarely troubled the House with a discussion of the purely religious aspects of this question, but he would like to say a word or two in reply to speeches of great power and obvious sincerity which had come from the representatives of the Labour Party. The hon. Member for Leicester and the hon. Member for Norwich were both supporters of the secular solution, and they had made very little of and minimised in every way the religious value of Cowper-Temple teaching or denominational teaching under the ordinary conditions of elementary school life. The great value of the Government plan was that they would have taught in the schools, as in practice was being done now, not religion in any full sense, but that on which religion could be based. At any rate there would be instruction given to the children in that great story of the life and death of Christ, which had altered the life of humanity during the last 1,900 years, and with which everyone in this country ought to be acquainted at as early an age as possible. Unless children became acquainted with it at an early time they would find it a disadvantage in after years when they would have to put their own interpretation upon it. He had only one other word to say. He supported the compromise at this stage, but he could not conceal from himself the fact that this compromise was one in which those who held opinions such as he had held for years on this subject were giving up to the very extreme that which they could give, even for the sake of peace and for the sake of a settlement. In Committee he claimed that they were entitled to discuss whether the clauses of the Bill actually carried out the settlement which had been advocated by his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education. If this settlement was disturbed in any material particular, if there were more concessions made by those who placed the highest importance on public control and the absence of privilege, then the compromise would be sure to break down. He had no words of hostile criticism to apply to his hon. friends who felt it was their duty to support a Motion for the rejection of the Bill. He felt certain that behind them there was a considerable body of public opinion, and all he wished to say upon that point was that the settlement proposed had gone to the extreme limit. With a full sense that he would be doing his duty to the House and to his constituency he intended to vote for the Second Reading of this Bill. He should, nevertheless, watch with the utmost concern the progress of the Bill through Committee, and he should retain absolute freedom of action upon the subsequent stages of the Bill. If the hopes of peace came to fruition, he was sure they would all be delighted, but this could only happen if on both sides of the House the greatest restraint were practised, and if the basis of the settlement remained unmodified.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said the hon. Member who had just sat down had addressed his speech chiefly to his colleagues on the other side of the House. That speech indicated that the hon. Member had persuaded himself with some difficulty to support this Bill. He was himself compelled to announce with deep regret that he was obliged to divide himself from the right hon. Baronet who spoke from the bench beside him, for he could not support the Bill. He was aware that in a great debate like this it was only fair that each hon. Member should direct himself to one aspect only of the many points which arose throughout this Bill. It was a great responsibility which they all recognised for anyone to resist what apparently appeared to be a movement towards peace. They had heard exhortations which had moved them strongly in that sense, and he would be the last person to doubt the sincerity of those exhortations, or the motives which prompted them. He was struck, in listening to the President of the Board of Education, with one curious change in his speech as it proceeded. At the beginning of his speech the right hon. Gentleman referred to those on both sides who found difficulty in agreeing to this Bill as swash-bucklers, but at the close of his speech he spoke of them as those who were the most conscientious Members of each Party.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I used the word, but it was not used in that sense.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said the right hon. Gentleman, at any rate, attributed the difficulties which had arisen to the swashbucklers.

MR. RUNCIMAN: What I said was that during the last ten years of strife the only people who had thoroughly enjoyed themselves were the swashbucklers.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK thought those who held most conscientious convictions on this subject were entitled to greater respect. He felt bound to say that whatever the exhortations for conciliation might be, and whatever motives might prompt them, he had his doubts of a reconciliation which had not been brought about upon sound and strongly held principles, but arose in a great measure from boredom. They had been told that the country had been bored to death with this question, and it ought to be settled in some way or another. He was opposed to any reconciliation made from mere weariness. The point he wished to direct attention to was whether the interests of real sound administration of education which were not likely to go to the wall from a huddled up reconciliation between two fundamentally irreconcilable standpoints. The Secretary to the Admiralty had told them how essential it was that they should advance in education, and he quite agreed with him. It did not, however, do any good to exaggerate or to use very high-sounding words about the great work that had been done inside the schools. On the whole, he was inclined to think that education in their schools was something which those sitting on the Opposition side desired to advance just as much as the Secretary to the Admiralty. For over 100 years, the Secretary to the Admiralty said, they had been fighting this question of religion in the schools. He wondered whether the hon. Member had found out when the connection of the State with education began. That connection commenced exactly seventy-six years ago. It was in the year 1832 that grants were made by Lord John Russell to education, and it was a curious fact that for exactly one half of that period—namely, thirty-eight years—they carried on education without any Education Acts at all. Before 1870 they did not have any of those great disputes about religion. He had made himself acquainted with this subject because it happened to be his duty to do so, and he was fully acquainted with the provisions of the various Minutes of the Education Department from 1832 to 1870. He was absolutely ignorant of any sign in those minutes of those acute disputes which the hon. Member opposite had cited. On the contrary, gradually step-by-step their administration became more liberal. The national school system was extended to the Catholic schools and to the British schools, as the schools of the Nonconformists were then called, and before 1870 the necessity of a connection with any religious communion was done away with. The advance in education made between 1832 and 1870 without any Acts of Parliament was proportionately as great as it had been from 1870 to 1908. In fact a great deal of their difficulties had been caused by the disputes which had arisen from the Acts of Parliament which had been passed dealing with education. An Act of Parliament was necessary for certain administrative reasons because they had to establish local authorities, and they had to confer upon them the right to raise an education rate. But what, after all, were the Education Acts? They were not really Education Acts but administrative provisions. Mr. Speaker had held over and over again that educational directions were matters for the administration of the Department and for the Code, and not matters that ought to be dealt with in the Education Acts at all. What was the first principle which had thus emerged out of the disputes over these Education Acts? It was one of which they heard much in 1906, and it was that there should be no duality in schools, but one unity of administration. Where had that gone now? He himself saw no need of it in 1906, and he had not pledged himself to that shibboleth. The other day the Under-Secretary for the Colonies made a speech in which he said that "the greater variety the better, and that nothing could be worse than one fixed immutable type of school." Those were the very words which he himself used in 1906 and for which he was denounced. Was unity the ideal now? Duality was expressly allowed in the management under this Bill. Another principle was no tests for teachers. He made bold to say that there never had been a test for any man to become a teacher since certificates were first granted. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] Well, was any religious test or examination required for a man who desired a certificate? The Department had no right to ask what his religion was. A certificate might be granted to a Buddhist or a Mussulman. But if they inserted a provision in the Bill enabling the teacher to volunteer to give certain religious instruction, local education authorities would appoint teachers whose views were in accordance with their own in this matter, and so long as human nature continued to be what it was, he contended that that would be a test. If he were a member of a local education authority at this moment he would endeavour to secure the appointment of a man who would carry on the teaching in accordance with his own views, and he was certain hon. Members opposite in a like position would take the same course. If a Mussulman obtained a certificate from the Department, was it the least likely that he would find a post under the London Education Authority, or would an Anglican obtain a post under a Nonconformist education authority?

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): We should give the appointment to the best man regardless of his private religious views.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said the last of the principles which had emerged in these disputes about Education Bills, was that they were to have public control. That had become a sort of shibboleth, but it was one the importance of which might be exaggerated. They had been told a great deal about the excellence of the educational system in Germany. Was there public control there? Everyone desired that education should be as efficient as it could be made, but he did not think anyone cared a straw whether it was given under public control or not. The former contentions of the Liberal Party that there should be no duality or variety in schools, and that there should be public control of all schools, were abstract theories, formed in discussing the administrative provisions of Education Bills, and had given way one after another when they were examined. Now the Government were attempting to make a compromise which would cripple education and make fetters for their own hands, for the Department, for the local authorities, and for the teachers. Did the right hon. Gentleman intend that the fixed grants were to apply only to the contracting-out schools?

MR. RUNCIMAN: If my hon. friend had read the Schedule he would know that they apply to the contracting-out schools. The other schools are dealt with under the Memorandum circulated by my predecessor in February last.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said he knew quite well that in the form in which the Bill was presented they applied only to contracting-out schools, but what he wanted to know was whether they were limited to those schools. Was the elasticity which had existed hitherto in other schools to go on? If so, would that be fair treatment to the contracting-out schools which were represented by hon. Members below the gangway? The managers and teachers would be fettered by the proposals now made. There had been faults and defects in connection with past educational methods in Scotland as well as in England, but if there was one thing of which Scotland was entitled to be proud it was the old parish school which made the youth of that country for generations what they were. The parochial teacher in the past had become the proverbial type of a good teacher. How would the right hon. Gentleman have been treated if he had attempted to say to one of these parochial teachers that he should have no part in the giving of religious instruction to the children, and that somebody else would come in at a certain hour to give that instruction in a particular prescribed form? He ventured to say that such an attempt would have been strongly resented. They were told sometimes that the schoolmaster was the man who formed the character of the child, but if they took out of his hands that part of instruction which went to form character, how was that influence to be exercised in future? Religion was not the only thing on which there might be difference of opinion. Were they going to extend their limitations to such questions as temperance, tariff reform, and free trade? There might be members of local authorities holding fanatical views on these and other questions, and they might wish to appoint teachers who would advance their views. Once they began to interfere with the freedom of a school they would not be able to stop at religion; they would be forced to apply the same reasoning in connection with other subjects. He held no brief for sectarians of one kind or another, but he was deeply interested in the future free development of the schools. He concurred with what the Leader of the Opposition said earlier in the evening, namely, that they could settle these disputes solely by giving perfectly equal treatment. He thought they must not only give perfectly equal treatment, but they must give perfect freedom. He had been referred to as the Member who first of all moved an Amendment in favour of contracting-out. When he did so he had not the support of his hon. friends on this side, and, although the Leader of the Opposition made a sympathetic speech on the subject, he did not get his support. Matters had developed in the direction he had indicated, and it was with a feeling of pride that he found the Secretary to the Admiralty supporting a proposal which he formerly described as the worst expedient which could possibly be adopted. But there was contracting-out and contracting-out. He wished a contracting-out which would be fair and equal to both sides. He did not wish a form of contracting-out under which certain schools would be selected and others excluded. He should then leave these local authorities absolute freedom. It was on these grounds that he felt bound to vote against the Second Reading of the Bill.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down knew very well the history of education in Scotland, but he did not understand the history of the development of education in England; otherwise he would not have made the statement that these religious wranglings and ecclesiastical squabbles had not impaired the efficiency of real and effective education in this country. Apparently the hon. Gentleman had never heard of the Cockerton judgment, which had impaired the efficiency of the school board and had certainly interfered with the efficiency of education. That judgment was obtained by people who went in for denominationalism in the interests of the denominations.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said he did not think that the Cockerton judgment had anything to do with denominationalism.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES said that they knew who was responsible for that judgment. It was not obtained in the interests of the London School Board, but purely from sectarian rivalry.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK asked if the hon. Member suggested that the permanent official of the Local Government Board who stopped these payments was moved by sectarian feeling?

*MR. WILLIAM JONES said that the whole inquiry was moved by sectarian feeling which had been going on for years. Thousands of Church parents in London were perfectly satisfied with what had been going on before the Cockerton judgment, and had freely paid their rates. He had only referred to this to show that it was because of these ecclesiastical and denominational issues that the real trend of educational development in this country had been arrested; and that that was why we were so far behind some of the other countries in Europe. There was a desire on both sides to support the compromise embodied in the Bill. He meant to vote for the Second Reading, although he could not say that he liked some of its provisions. During the controversy of 1902, he, in common with many of his colleagues, tried to get something not unlike this compromise, knowing that without it they might go on for generations neglecting the best interests of education. The hon. Member for Mayo, he well remembered, wanted, in the interest of the children, to allow representatives of the parents on the Education Committee; but the right hon. Gentleman opposite went into the lobby against the proposal. The fact was that they had had no real education debate in the House at all for a long time. He was not blaming educationists on the other side; but he had not heard a speech with a real grasp of the interest of the children since the days of Mr. Acland and Sir John Gorst. In this House every Education Minister had been crippled owing to the fact of these controversial issues between Anglicans, Catholics, and Nonconformists. Personally he had always been a believer in religious education. He was not for secularism. He had been in some places in England and Wales where Catholics and Anglicans had united to frame a syllabus based on the Christian faith, suitable to meet the desires of the parents, and to be taught to the children. He could never see the possibility of the Catholic schools coming into the great unity to obtain a fully national system of education; and for the reason that they must have, and always had had historically, a different system under which the authority of their Church was supreme. He did not blame them for that; he blamed no man, whether Anglican, broad Churchman, low Churchman, or Catholic for believing in the authority of his Church. His regret was that the Catholics could not enter into the national system, because they believed that their Church must be the dominant factor in the whole education of their children. He respected them for their convictions, and he admired them for the sacrifices they had made for these convictions. He was delighted to find the development they had made in the training of their teachers, and the facilities they granted some of their teachers to attend lectures in Universities and University Colleges.

In spite of some progress like this the nation had still those ecclesiatical difficulties between it and the highest training of the teacher and the development of the continuation schools. The most of the time of the permanent officials at the Board of Education was taken up with these ecclesiastical difficulties. Combatants on both sides who had fought furiously, each looking at the question from their own point of view, now desired to call a truce. He knew it would be said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer who had fought so valiantly in these educational struggles could not possibly be a good conciliator. But had the right hon. Gentleman not shown himself to be a wise and tactful conciliator in various disputes ? More than that, two or three years ago the right hon. Gentleman was in treaty with a Welsh bishop and they would have come to a pacific compromise which would have settled the education question for a whole generation but for outside interference. What had happened now ? His right hon. friend the Minister for Education, as representative of the Government, had entered into communication with the Nonconformists and with the Primate of all England ; and was met in a spirit of conciliation. He heartily congratulated both the representatives of the Anglicans and the Nonconformists. The Primate ought to know what the majority of his Church wanted. He knew there was a small minority of High Anglicans who were against compromise and they might contract-out, but there were thousands more who would come into this great unity in order to secure a national system. He looked upon this arrangement as a step forward towards getting more education for our children along the right line. He would deal generously with his Catholics friends. He had discussed the question with members of their Hiearchy, but had failed to get anything like a true understanding with them that they could ever in England and Wales, as things were, enter into a truly national system. Well, apart from these Catholic friends, the combatants on either side had come to the point of forgetting to intensify their difficulties in way of a settlement. They had come to acknowledge that there was another standpoint than their own. They had sufficient imagination to see that their enemy might become their friend. The Nonconformists had seen that there was a Church case, and the Church had seen that there was a Nonconformist case, and by doing that they helped to clear the way and open a broad avenue for educational development—a development which seemed so close now, but which before stood so far off. He meant educational development, not only in the elementary schools, but in the continuation schools similar to that which had taken place in the schools of Germany, Switzerland, Denmark and America. He wanted more power given to the Education Department. There were some of the most expert educationists in the country in the Department who knew everything that was best with regard to education in other countries as well as at home; and he hoped, when the religious controversies had been settled by this compromise, that his right hon. friend, who was young, capable, and enthusiastic, would be able to turn his attention in the future to the development of those great educational problems. There were several practical problems before us before we could compare with Germany, Switzerland or Denmark. For thoroughness of method he thought we were in advance of many of them, and he had seen some of the best schools in America as well as in Germany and other Continental countries. He had examined them pretty studiously, and had come into close contact with the directors and teachers. American and Continental experts all agreed that for thoroughness of method we were equal to anybody, but the average was not raised. The continuation period was cut short, and we wanted to deal with the most critical period in the child's life between fourteen and seventeen or fourteen and eighteen. What were we doing for our children during that period of adolescence ? It appeared to him that our education system was crippled in its endeavour, to those needs. It was important, for the sake of all, that this religious difficulty should be settled. This proposal would settle the teachers problem, because the overwhelming majority would come into the same category, and would derive the same advantages and the contracting-out schools would grow less and less. In the course of every year it was an alarming fact that more than 500,000 children in England and Wales left the public elementary schools at thirteen or fourteen years of age, and not more than one out of three of those children received in point of general or technical education any further systematic course of instruction. That was the most critical period in a child's life, and, instead of taking the great question in hand, hon. and right hon. Gentlemen had been squabbling about their ecclesiastical differences. They forgot the great period of adolescence, but he thought they ought to put their minds and their hearts together to settle this question in the interests of citizenship. Let them certainly give a child religious education, and he should like some of his English friends to come to gallant little Wales and see how they gave religious education to the children there and how they continued that religious education throughout life. Religious education was not merely given in schools, and sometimes it was not given there at all. In three or four counties at one time it was not given at all in the schools, but those counties were the most crimeless counties in Wales, and sacrificed more for education, elementary, secondary and University, than any others that one could see throughout the whole realm. The quarrymen and peasants of Carnarvonshire, Cardiganshire and Merionethshire had fine Sunday schools, and their scholars never left them. He wished some friends of his in the House would come to their schools and see children, parents, and grandparents all taught together, and at night in their homes they would see sometimes the father writing an essay on some scriptural subject in competition with his own son. That was what happened constantly, and that was the way to look to the religious education of the children, not to leave them when they were thirteen years of age to become hobbledehoys and irreverent corner boys. Therefore, in the interest of peace and of education, some basis should be secured under which progress could be made with this problem. They had helped Scotland to get it, and nobody was more glad than he was, as he said in the Grand Committee, than to see continuity of education being made compulsory under the Bill for Scotland. We also wanted it for England and Wales. He did not mean that they should have a system of evening classes just for certain boys and girls of thirteen or fourteen, but they should have a continuous course of education. To work them by day and then suppose that they could get something into their minds at night was not, however, the way to conduct education in this country. Some employers had opened continuation schools for their apprentices, not after an irksome day's toil, but on some afternoon in the week. They had sent them to these schools without reducing their wages, and the result was that the lads became better labourers, better citizens, and more manly men. If they could only get this sectarian issue out of the way as he hoped they would by this compromise, and that was why he believed in it, if they could get hon. Gentlemen from all sides of the House to join together to help to complete the ladder of real education for real citizenship, for science and for the best equipment of the nation, then they would have better training of teachers, a better method of joining the elementary schools with the secondary and higher and technical schools, as well as build up a system of continuation schools. That was why he wanted the Labour Members to join. Let them look at the half-time system in the textile industries in Yorkshire and Lancashire. Could anybody there defend it? The work was irksome and the task in the school became drudgery. What happened? It whittled away the best of human nature. Let them think of the children and of the nation, and use this compromise as a bridge and solve this question once for all. Let them quench this ecclesiastical brand in order that the educationist and the schoolmaster might bring their best and highest influences to bear upon the children of our schools.

*MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said the House was always pleased to welcome the eloquence of the hon. Member who had just addressed it, and if he could agree with him that under this Bill they had an absolute safeguard of a real settlement, as he hoped, and if he could also believe as the hon. Member seemed to, that there would be an opportunity of better secondary and higher education and of better training of teachers, that would be a very great inducement to him to give it his support. He would like, however, to remind the hon. Gentleman that those subjects, which were, perhaps, the most urgent portions of our educational system, were not touched in any sense by this Bill.

Mr. WILLIAM JONES pointed out that this Bill might be used as a bridge to them. That was all he said.

*Mr. LANE-FOX said he wished to call attention to the fact that the question of secondary and higher education was not touched by this Bill. The hon. Member for Louth in a most illuminating speech complained that he had not been brought into negotiation in connection with this settlement, and one wished very much that he had been, because if he had made his speech to the Archbishops and Bishops, he thought they would have received much more charity than they had done, the result of the negotiations. He did not wish to suggest that anything that had been done by hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side had been actuated by anything but the most absolute sincerity and a desire to solve this question. He gave them full credit for that. Nobody could pretend that they were doing any good in the constituencies or winning votes. Nobody could suppose that they were wishing to gain electoral advantages, and he learned that already one Member had been burned in effigy in his constituency. He gave them all credit for trying to meet and settle this very difficult question, but there was, he thought, less absolute urgency in regard to it than hon. Members assumed. The hon. Member for Camberwell spoke of the great advance which Germany had made for years past in this matter of education. It was true that advances had been made in technical and higher education, but it was elementary education to which alone this Bill applied, and it was in elementary education alone that the Church of England had done such a great work. The hon. Member who seconded the rejection of the Bill, and also the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington, an ex-member of the Government, laid stress on the fact that this religious difficulty was not a serious question in the school itself. As the hon. Member who seconded the Motion said, it was a matter for parties and for the platform, but it was not a matter which had entered largely into our schools. He thought that when they were asked to accept this compromise because it was supposed to be one which was satisfactory to the Church of England, they should look at the last letter written by the Archbishop of Canterbury on this subject, in which he said that although the bishops of the Church assented to it, one limb of the body was paralysed. Supposing he was engaged in selling the President of the Board of Education a horse—which he should never try to do, because the right hon. Gentleman was much cleverer than he was, and would have the better of it—but supposing for the sake of argument that was the case. Supposing he sold the horse and the very next day he wrote and told him that one limb of the animal was paralysed, he supposed in the ordinary practice of horse dealing the right hon. Gentleman could refuse to carry out the bargain. Until the Government were able to show that the bargain had been absolutely carried out they must abide by that declaration that one limb of the body was paralysed. That was one of the grounds upon which he was going to vote against the Bill. Several Members were going to vote in favour of it, not because they believed in it, but because they believed in the ideal behind it. If the Government improved the Bill, as he hoped they would, on the Committee stage, he would on the Third Reading have an opportunity of voting for it if he desired to do so. The Bishop of London in his letter had dwelt upon the advantages which the Church of England would gain by the Bill. As to the right of entry, the whole thing depended upon whether it was going to be real. It was not quite so much a matter of what use the Church would make of the right of entry, as what the local authority would allow that right of entry to be. Upon that depended the question of whether this was really a valuable set off to the undoubted loss which the Church must suffer in her control and prestige and in her power. In the whole of the rural districts they lost the inestimable advantage, from the point of view of those who valued denominational teaching, of having that instruction given by the head teacher, and there was also the loss of the appointment of teachers. It seemed to him obvious that this was a very serious loss indeed for the Church. He was the last person in the world to say a word against the clergymen of this country, but a man might be most excellently qualified to be a parish priest, but he might not be able to take a class of unruly boys; and if, under the right of entry, the teaching was to be given by outside teachers, it was not going to be of any serious or real value to those who received it. It was also not going to be good for the conduct of the school, but bad for discipline, and all the objections which had been so strongly emphasised by the teachers of the country were, he thought, likely to be found to be true. By what possible right did the Government deny the same right of contracting-out to the rural districts that they gave to the urban? The rural schools would lose every considerably from the Church point of view by this Bill, and hon. Gentlemen did not realise how much that loss appealed to those who believed in denominationalism. The Bill undoubtedly established a new form of State religion, and he wanted to know why the bishops and archbishops had ventured to put such a strong argument in favour of disestablishment in the mouths of those who would use it. But the most important question of all was what did right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite really mean. He gave them absolute credit for wanting to settle this question in the best interests of everybody, but he wanted to know what was at the back of the mind of the hon. Gentlemen behind the Government who were going to vote for this Bill. Were they voting for it as what was called an instalment or what Dr. Clifford had called quite a definite approach to his ideal, or were they going to carry out this compromise in a genuine, honest, and uncompromising spirit? They had only had one Member for Wales speaking. Were the whole of the council schools in Wales really going to be thrown open? Was the Church teacher to be welcomed in those schools and equal opportunities to be given to all the children in the Welsh schools, and were the children of one denomination to be treated on an equality with the children of another? They had not heard that stated by representatives from either Wales or Yorkshire. Was it intended to carry out this compromise in a generous and full spirit? Was any hon. Gentleman prepared to get up and stake his faith that if this Bill came into law there would be absolute equality of opportunity for the Church in every school? The right of entry would be absolutely what the local authority made it. The local authorities might say that the teacher was required for the general conduct of the school; that there was no accommodation available; that they had not proved their desires in accordance with the regulations. Although the House was told these regulations were necessary nobody knew what might happen. Experience in the past had taught them that the appeal to the Board of Education would be worthless, because the Board of Education would find themselves in the position of not being able to do what they would like to do. They had an illustration of that in the West Riding case. A teacher, when appointed to be manager of a school was refused the appointment by the local authority on educational grounds. The education authority had no chance to refuse to appoint except on educational grounds. Under pressure of the National Union of Teachers that man had now been appointed by the same education authority to a bigger school at a larger salary, but the Board of Education would not or could not reverse the original decision of the education authorities. There were in this Bill not one, but many, loopholes far bigger than that in the Act of 1902 through which the education authorities could drive a coach and four if they wanted to make this right of entry impossible. The assistant teacher would have to volunteer. In a hostile area what teacher would dare to volunteer? What about the pressure which would be put upon him by those who did not wish him to volunteer? There would be two questions to consider when a teacher volunteered. He was not going to be paid for this teaching; the particular denomination was going to pay a fine in relief of the local rates, and that was done undoubtedly so that there should not be any advantage with the teacher who had volunteered to give the teaching. The question of the single-school areas hit the Church far harder than the Roman Catholics for the reason that there were very few Roman Catholic schools in these areas. There was one other question to which he would like to refer, and that was the question of paying the expenses of the new schools in the county areas. In the West Riding they had suffered very heavily by this. The large number of school places in excess of those required owing to the shifting of the population had hit them very greatly in the rural districts; at the present time they were paying, for this reason, twice the amount necessary for school accommodation in rural villages. They were told that the Church schools were dying, and that these were the best terms that could be given. All he could say was that if these were the best terms they could get, and if the terms that were given to them were not to be a reality, they had better stick to what they had got earlier than lay down their arms, and get nothing at all. And that was the position they were prepared to take up.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) hoped the House would bear with him for a moment, because he did not speak one word through all the interminable debates on the Licensing Bill. He was very much exercised on the present Bill. On the one hand he could not bear to vote in favour of the right of entry, which he felt to be very wrong; and on the other he could not bear to vote against public control of rural schools, and the abolition of tests for teachers, whilst in the third place he did not like walking out. He hoped, however, that the right of entry would not be much used, and that it would perhaps fall into disuse. He knew what sort of pressure would be brought to bear upon people, and regarded with horror the idea of a Church of England rector, and perhaps two or three Nonconformist ministers, possibly even a Roman Catholic priest or a Jewish Rabbi, going round the parish with petitions demanding denominational education. They all knew how easy signatures were obtained to petitions. Even Members sometimes signed petitions which they knew nothing about. These petitions would all be signed by every parent in the parish. It was a great gain that no public money would be allocated to denominational teaching; but he thought there should be a small rent charged for the time the schools were used for denominational education. Great as was his objection to this right of entry, he acknowledged that to get popular control in all the single-school areas was a very great advantage. He should have been very pleased if it had been as in the old days of the elected school boards, when people were encouraged to take an interest in the management of the schools. He wished to say that he thought a great mistake was made as to the number of Church of England schools. He knew that in his part of the country a great many were squire schools. They were built by the squire of the parish, most of them in the first half of the last century. They were never intended to be denominational schools, but the Church of England in the old days was very evangelical, and there was no objection to its teaching; it was only in the last few years that, with the spread of the Romanising thought, objections had arisen. A great many of what were called Church schools now did not, therefore, really belong to the Church. Another great advantage was that there would be the abolition of tests; and, taking all these considerations together, he had come to the conclusion that it was his duty to vote for the Bill. He owned he wished a bolder line had been taken. He would have liked to have seen a Bill which would have defined an elementary school as a school over which there was perfect, absolute control, in which simple Bible-teaching should be given, and that it should have been enacted that no other school should receive public money. Such a Bill might have been thrown out by the Lords, but they might have retorted by refusing to vote the grant. Failing that, he thought they must adopt this Bill, despite its great faults. There was, of course, the alternative of the secular solution. The hon. Member for Leicester brought that forward strongly yesterday; and, when he heard that most devout Nonconformists and a great many clergy of the Church of England were all equally in favour of secular education, he must say that he felt almost shaken in his opposition of last year. He was rather afraid, however, that it would engender rivalry amongst the different denominations and make them apt to insist too much upon their own particular doctrines and not enough upon fundamental principles. The hon. Member put forward a most extraordinary plea for secular education. He asked what was the use of religious instruction three-quarters of an hour every day. He thought it was acknowledged by all experts in education that three-quarters of an hour was quite long enough in which to keep a child occupied on one subject. He did not suppose any parent gave more than half an hour or three-quarters at the most each day to the religious education of his child, and after all, that was the best instruction in religion which the child could receive.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth) said he hoped the House would give him an opportunity to speak. He spoke on neither of the two previous Bills; and, as the only Catholic Member for London, he claimed to voice the feelings of his community. He wished he could join in the felicitations of both sides of the House on this arrangement. He appreciated it as much as any non-Protestant could; but he felt that in this matter the Catholic schools were paying the price. He regarded it from the standpoint of educational efficiency. They were told by hon. Members on both sides of the House that they had sacrificed much, opinions and principles. The Catholics were sacrificing money, a very important thing. The Catholic school was the earthen vessel that had been smashed between these jangling Protestant pots. There were in London 30,000 pupils in the Catholic schools. At present the average grant was 75s., whereas the school board grant was 123s. The Catholic pupils were therefore put in a position of extreme inferiority. It was proposed by the Bill still further to reduce that small grant from 75s. to 50s. The Catholic schools would thus receive two-fifths of what the board schools received. This Bill affected the honour of the Liberal Party. He saw that one of the Manchester Members only yesterday referred to the increased grant given to the Catholic schools. He had looked through the pledges given by Lancashire Members, and he found that without exception they gave the pledge that in the settlement of the education question the Catholic schools should not suffer. The Catholic schools were suffering; they were being degraded by the Liberal Party from the position given them by the Leader of the Opposition It was quite true they were not as efficient as the board schools, but they had been steadily rising; and it had fallen to the Liberal Party to associate themselves with an act of religious persecution, to push down the Catholic schools into the old slough of despond, and to deprive them of the advantage which the Conservative Party had given them. There was something peculiarly unbecoming in a democratic party doing this great injury to the children of the poor. He did not wish to intrude long on the attention of the House, but he was separating himself from his party, and he did it with extreme regret. Three years ago, when he was elected a Liberal Member, he naturally thought it impossible to find the Liberal Party doing this wrong to the poor of any community. It would be very easy indeed to escape from this wrong. The Bill brought in in 1906 by the present Chief Secretary was adopted practically by every moderate man in the House. The Liberal Party thought this was an admirable solution of the question. Why did not they bring in that Education Bill again as they did with the Scottish Bills? Why had they brought in this thing, which was an agreement between a most rev. prelate and one or two gentlemen on this side? Why did not the Government bring in that measure again, or at least the fourth clause of it, instead of the present measure, which, by a back-door arrangement, would force Catholics into a position of inefficiency and inferiority? Why should the children of Catholics, who had to carry out every duty of citizens, be put in a position of inferiority? The Catholic soldier fought for his country, and when he came back and settled in London or Liverpool, why should he have his children deprived of the advantages that every other citizen of the country received? Being forced by these considerations to vote against his Government, he thought it was his duty plainly and vigorously to state the reasons that influenced him.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said that though he did not often find himself in accord with the views of Gentlemen opposite, he certainly intended to vote for the Second Reading of this Bill. The hon. Member for Barkston Ash said he believed the right of entry clauses were not strong enough and were not a reality, and he would vote against the Second Reading, but if he found in Committee that they were a reality he would vote for the Third Reading. He (Lord Willoughby de Eresby) hoped by voting for the Second Reading to find out in Committee whether the right of entry clauses were a reality or not, and if they were not he should vote against the Third Reading, which appeared to be a rather more sensible line to take up. He had never for a moment sympathised with the passive resistance movement. He had always recognised that the last Conservative Education Act was a compromise. The Church at that time made very large concessions, and equally Nonconformists did not get all they wanted. When the passive resistance movement started he considered it had very small grounds of justification, for the simple reason that owing to the fact that all the rates were paid into a common county fund, no man could possibly state that the money he paid in was paid to a particular school. For all he knew it might be spent on some council school or Nonconformist school. No man could say he was paying for a religion of which he disapproved. He had, on the other hand, always felt, especially in rural districts, that there was a very real grievance among those who held strong Nonconformist views that they should be bound to send their children to a school where, according to them, the Church atmosphere prevailed. He thought this grievance was largely exaggerated on the platform, but at the same time he recognised that at the last election there undoubtedly was among the electors a very strong feeling that fairness was not being meted out all round, and that there should be some change in the system of religious instruction. He had always thought the only two possible solutions of this difficulty were right of entry or the secular solution. He believed it would be a very serious day indeed for this country when religion was banished from our schools. He should certainly support this proposal for the right of entry. If the Church of England did its duty, as it had done in the past, and really was the national Church, it would by the right of entry be able to get to the children in the schools and to teach the religion of the Church of England, which he for one was proud to have been brought up in. If on the other hand the Church was decaying and had not the same vital force, it ought no longer to hold that proud position. It must stand on its merits, and if the regular teachers could not be got to give the instruction, it would be the duty of the clergymen to go and give it if they were really anxious for denominational teaching. It had been said the teachers were opposed to this because it would not make for educational efficiency. He fully believed they ought to pay every attention to teachers' opinion in the matter. No one was more qualified to speak than they, but they spoke with a certain amount of prejudice. They had first of all to consider the schools and the children, and not the teachers. After all, the teacher existed for the school and not the school for the teacher. He therefore hoped the Bill would pass Second Reading, that the right of entry would be made a reality, and that instead of hampering the work of the Church of England it would be an incentive to all churchmen to see that denominational teaching was given in every school throughout the land.

*MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said it was allowed by the Liberals that this was a very difficult Bill to understand. They had made it difficult purposely because they wanted to rush it through the House before anybody understood what it meant. They did not want the country to know how bad and unjust a Bill it was. It seemed pretty clear, according to the Minister for Education, that its object was to squeeze out as soon as possible all the voluntary schools. The hon. Member for West Ham had put it very nicely before he joined the Government. He told the House of Laymen that when the Church schools had been undenominationalised a movement would arise from the same quarter to treat the Church in a similar manner, and the Church of England Members might have a pretty good idea from that what was likely to happen if in a fit of good nature or indolence they let the Bill pass. Let them look at what it meant. The Government was setting up a religion of its own, and it compelled everybody to pay rates for it, including rates for new schools for that religion, and it was a religion of which millions of people in this country did not at all approve. In fact, they very much objected to it, and people who did not believe in it were to have large numbers of their schools, with the furniture and apparatus, taken away by force and only paid a very small sum, and this was in spite of its being a compulsory sale. Then with a quite insufficient Government grant some people would have to bear extra financial burdens for their schools, and he thought that included in many cases repairs and religious teaching, whilst they had to pay rates towards the instruction in Government schools of this Government religion. The voluntary schools in the single school areas were in some cases built and endowed by people, more than anything else, so that their particular religion should be taught. What would happen was that on three days a week they would have taught in those schools a religion of which they did not approve, and there was very little chance that they would have their religion taught on the other two days. No child in Government schools need attend any religious instruction at all on any day of the week. There were no religious tests to be applied to teachers at all, so that teachers with no knowledge of religion would be supposed to teach the Cowper-Temple religion or some similar system which might be invented by local authorities. It was not even certain that they would have anybody to give religious instruction at all in those schools. The teachers were not obliged to give it. If they all refused there would be no religion. They could not have religious teaching if there was no one to teach it. But there would be a test all right if a teacher declined to teach it, because teachers who refused would in many cases lose their employment. They put very severe tests on teachers as to geography and arithmetic, but on the question of religion, which was far more important, they had absolutely no test at all. They might be anything. The whole thing was an absolute farce if religious teaching was to be of the slightest value. In Government schools if children were really to have daily religious instruction, they would have an atheist teaching Roman Catholic Church of England children and a Nonconformist teaching Jews, and things might get very awkward. If a Nonconformist teacher with an uncomfortably powerful conscience, and there were such things, was appointed to a Jewish school, he might, like the rider of a certain celebrated and talkative roadster, feel compelled to teach what he believed to be the truth, and might tell his pupils that the Jews were composed mostly of Pharisees and publicans, with the order of merit very much in favour of the publicans. The religious teaching of a vast number of children was going to be sacrificed for the worldly advantage of a very small number of teachers, and he supposed hon. Members opposite called that democratic legislation, whilst it was really the very reverse. He had not been able to make out whether a child could be compelled to go to a contracting-out school or not, but schools which contracted-out were expected to be just as efficient with a very insufficient Government grant as schools which had the rates to lean on. The first Lord of the Admiralty, when he was Minister for Education, when a Catholic deputation visited him, said he did not pretend that the 47s. Government grant would meet even present expenditure. How did he tell the Catholics to get out of it? He suggested that Catholics should get teachers who would come for less money than the teachers in the Government schools, and he admitted there would not only be a large loss of income from public funds, but that it would not cost the Roman Catholics more than £100,000 a year. In his opinion it would cost them a lot more. The right of entry, as he understood it, was practically useless, and apparently the local authority might institute any syllabus it liked. It might very possibly be nothing but simple Bible reading which was no good at all and would merely bore the children. Local Authorities had instituted this kind of teaching before and the probability was that they would do it again. There was a great difference between this country and Germany. In this country Catholics built schools and the Government did its best to take them away by squeezing them out financially. In Germany the Government built schools for the Catholics wherever and whenever they were wanted. The Minister for Education told them that the only thing which would make the Bill work was the good feeling of the local authorities. It seemed to him that was expecting everybody to behave in a fair and reasonable way. He thought that was certainly not the custom of the Liberal Party generally, or of their Nonconformist supporters in particular. The right hon. Gentleman made a point of the proposal which would confer on contracting-out schools the great advantage of being able to charge fees. That was not free education. The Bill was a clever cunning attempt on the part of Nonconformists to hoodwink the Church of England, and he was afraid that was what had happened to the poor Archbishop of Canterbury. If the Bill passed, the voluntary schools would be gradually wiped out of existence. That was practically admitted by the Minister for Education. He was afraid that the Nonconformist chapel was used in many places more for politics than prayers. The chief origin of Nonconformist dislike and jealousy of the Church of England rested with the Nonconformist ministers. He remembered that on one occasion the Chief Secretary for Ireland told them that Nonconformists were very jealous of the ivy-mantled towers of the Church of England. The chief reason for the attitude taken up by the Nonconformists was a social one, and he was extremely sorry for it. The Church of England parson was reckoned what was called a gentleman. By reason of that he went to the squire's or the lord of the manor's dinner parties, shooting parties, and his wife went to lawn-tennis parties, tea fights, and dances. The Nonconformist minister and his wife were not asked to any of these entertainments. Dr. Guinness Rogers complained in the public Press some time ago that he had never been asked to a single decent country house.

*MR. SPEAKER: May I invite the hon. Member to give his attention to the Bill?

*MR. HUNT said he thought what he was going to say had to do with the Bill. He was stating one of the reasons for the religious difficulty. The consequence of all this was that Nonconformist ministers were jealous of Church of England parsons and preached Radicalism and Little Englandism in the pulpit and out of it, by day and night, whenever they got the chance, and this was the very worst policy for the welfare of the working people and for the prosperity of the Empire. He really could not understand how the Church of England leaders could accept anything but a really fair settlement. This Bill certainly was not one. If Church of England people would go on taking everything lying down, they might depend upon it that the Nonconformists would go on kicking them. The members of the Church of England and of the Catholic Church built their schools and gave education long before the State undertook the work of education. That being so, surely they ought to be as well and as fairly treated as Nonconformists. Nonconformists had not done anything like so much for education as the Church of England and the Catholic Church. When the Nonconformists found that they could get their teaching for nothing, they gave up a great number of their schools, and they never had any of the terrible trouble with their consciences until they had to pay rates. The Church of England ought to stand out for fair terms. This Government's driving power was fairly gone. They certainly could not force this Bill into law if it was as resolutely opposed by the Church of England as it would be by Catholics. If it did pass, it would, unless the law was altered by the next Government, undoubtedly mean the destruction of the voluntary schools of the country. That was what the Government meant, and that would most certainly gradually lower the religious instruction in the schools till it was barely worth having. He did not think there was any doubt about it. Nothing could be worse for the country or more likely to lead to the destruction of the nation than to have its children brought up without any real religion. He hoped that none of his hon. friends would either vote for the Bill or abstain from voting against it from any craven fear that it would be a difficult subject for the Unionists when they came into power.

*MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing), who was received with cries of "Divide," said he did not intend to emulate his hon. friend the Member for Ludlow, but he intended to avail himself of the privilege to which he was entitled of speaking on behalf of nearly 25,000 electors. Even if the Government were in such a hurry to push the Bill through, hon. Members opposite might afford him the few moments necessary to enable him to put his views before them. He confessed he approached this measure with very great diffidence, because he might seem to be opposing the Bishop of London. But before he was acquainted with the subsequent views of the right rev. Prelate he felt he was in a very difficult position as to how he should deal with this Bill. [Cries of "Divide."] He was not speaking from a party point of view, but dealing with the Bill from the point of view of practical politics. [Cries of "Divide."] He would stand there until he got a hearing. [Continued cries of "Divide."] He had been interviewed by a most important deputation —a deputation representing all the teachers in his constituency——[Cries of "Divide."]—who pointed out to him that chaos would result in the schools if once this Bill came into operation in their district. "Just imagine the condition the schools would be in," said the deputation, "in our district, assuming that there was a right of entry to all denominations, if the denominational teachers were late in their arrival at the school! It would be impossible to keep order amongst the children." Then the members of the deputation pointed out the enormous difficulties that would arise in the administration of the schools, and they asked what would happen if, in a sudden emergency, the appointed person to give the denominational instruction was unable to come at the appointed time. And they asked him, in the interest of the children and in the interest of education itself, to support any Motion moved in the House that this Bill should be rejected. In the case of schools where mixed religious views were represented, the deputation asked if they as teachers were to scour the neighbourhood to get possession of a certain number of children to make up a sufficiently large number to make a class to whom a particular religious instruction was to be given. He listened to the criticisms of the members of the deputation, who, he was assured, differed very widely in their religious and political opinions, for a very long time, and he said to them: "Well, gentlemen, what is it you propose?" and their reply was "Leave things alone," for the existing condition of things was working admirably. He ventured to think that in view of that opinion by persons who were certainly interested in the education of the young, he was entitled to ask the House to pause before they gave a Second Reading to this Bill.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 323; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 417.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'wer Hamlets, S. Geo
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gordon, J.
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh

Mr. Nield.

Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Kimber, Sir Henry
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Rt Hn Sir C. B. (Leices.)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Nolfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Leslie
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Rt. Hn. H. L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset. E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wodehouse, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burke, E. Haviland-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dixon-Hartland, Sir FredDixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Keswick, William
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oddy, John James
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Percy, Earl
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheehy, David
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Hutton and Mr. Clement Edwards.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 27th November, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: My Lords, late last night the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees, knowing that he would not be able to be here early to-day, communicated with me with regard to this matter. I am acting for the noble Earl and at his request, and I understand the Motion to be entirely unopposed. I believe it to be an honest case of misunderstanding, and that in sanctioning the course proposed we shall be doing justice.

Moved, "That Standing Order No. 93 be considered in order to its being dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of Owners and Ratepayers in the Borough of Hanley."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Standing Order No. 93 considered (according to order) and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of Owners and Ratepayers in the Borough of Hanley. Leave given to present the said petition.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour of: Churches, etc., at Hayle (2), Copperhouse, Angarrack, Copperhouse, Hayle, Angorrack Twelveheads, Copperhouse, Black Rock (2), Trenwheal, St. Erth (4), Camborne, Copperhouse, Praze Crowan (2), Gwinear (2), Townsend (4), Leedstown (4), Middleton, Richmond, Gerrans, Edmondsley, St. Just, Gwyddblwern, Corwan, Craghead; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Pelow Grange; Wesleyan Methodist Church, St. Levan; The Inhabitants, St. Mary's Scilly; Churches, etc., at Birmingham (2), Settle (2), Wisbech, Haslington, Farnham, Mouldsworth (2), Lanlivery; Persons signing, Good Templars, Sudbury, Oxford, Barnstaple; 121 Tents of the Independent Order of Rechabites; International Order of Good Templars (3), Meetings at Chesterfield, Cwm, Great Harwood, Wilmslow; Women's United Prayer Meeting, Liverpool; Shipley and District Bible Class; Primitive Methodist Churches at Great Harwood, Bristol (15), Bath, Stroud (2), Chalford, Painswick, Butter Row, Sheepscombe, Miserden, Chippenham, Biddestone, Corsham, Derry Hill, Marshfield, Lawnden, Box Hill, Colerne, Kingston Langley, Radstock, Southsea, Redhampton, Stamshaw, Gosport, Purbrook, Ventnor, Ryde, Wroxall, Sandown, Ashton-under-Lyne (2), Lynn, Altrincham, Broadheath, Carrington, Glossop (2), Hadfield, Broadbottom, Prestwick, Unsworth, Hollandwood, Bolton (2), Atherton Tyldesley, Houghton (2), Hull (2), Cannock, Silkstone, Thorne, Walesley, Middle Rasen, Swinbrook; Wesleyan and Congregational Churches at Great Harwood; Independent Church, Port Maddock; Baptist Churches at Great Harwood, Cardiff; thirty-four lodges and meetings of the International Order of Good Templars; Inhabitants of the City of Leeds; Meetings at Everton Bradford, Penzance; Independent Methodist Church, Pasture Lane, Barrowford, Lancashire; Church Members Meeting; Independent Methodist Church, Southport; The Rev. Walter Holyoake, President of the Dover Evangelical Free Church Council; The Officers and Committee of the Mount Lion Band of Hope, Sheffield; The Alwington (North Devon) Band of Hope and Temperance Society; The Congregational Church, Gallowtree Gate, Leicester; The Hall Street Men's Own, Hall Street Baptist Mission, Greenleys, Manchester; Churches, Societies, etc., at Camelon, Newcastle, Aikten, Rechabites; Persons signing; Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Petitions against: Of persons signing (8); Liverpool and District (2); Cambridgeshire; Cheshire (6); Guildford; West Cumberland; Bradford-on-Avon; Macclesfield and District; North Wales and District; Licensed Victuallers of Oswestry; Persons signing (6); National

Trade Defence, Midland District; Eastbourne. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Petition praying for Amendment of: Of inhabitants of the diocese of Carlisle; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Order of yesterday for the printing of Rules made by the Board of Trade, discharged.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No. 2) BILL.

Draft regulations under Clause 2.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of April, 1908.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS AND TELEPHONES.

An account showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the telegraph service during the year ended 31st March, 1908, and the balance of the expenditure over receipts, prepared in pursuance of Section 4 of the 39th Vict., c. 5, and a statement additional to the above account, prepared in pursuance of the same section, together with an account showing the gross amount received and the gross amount expended in respect of the telegraph service and telephone service (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 18 of session 1908), and certain other statistics. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Order of the Day read for resuming the adjourned debate on the Amendment moved by the Marquess of Lansdowne to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2ª, viz., to leave out all the words after "That" for the purpose of inserting the following words: "this House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill."

***LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH**: My Lords, this debate, which has now extended over two days, has covered a great variety of subjects—social, political, financial, as well as others; and it is impossible to attempt to deal with more than a very small part of the issues which are presented to your Lordships for consideration at this time. But I think one thing stands out with great clearness. Amidst all the diversity of opinions which has been disclosed in the course of the debate in your Lordships' House, there is a practically unanimous desire on the part of every Member of this House to do anything we reasonably can to advance, in the best sense, the cause of temperance, and to make easier the path of social reform. And with almost every one that desire is accompanied with a hope that whatever is done should be done with due regard to fairness to all the interests concerned.

If I may venture to say so, some of the difficulties in which Parliament finds itself to-day arise from the position which is taken up by the extreme partisans of temperance legislation. It is no new difficulty. I think I am right in saying that one of the greatest obstacles to what I shall venture to describe as moderate temperance reform comes from those who desire, honestly and conscientiously I have no doubt, but with a determination which I think worthy of a better and more practical cause, totally to suppress and do away with the traffic in the whole class of articles which they class together as intoxicating liquors. I do not believe that is a result which ever will be attained, but I am confident that much more could have been done in the direction which all of us desire if these honest but, as I think, mistaken partisans would for a time, at any rate, moderate their zeal. I have no doubt that many of your Lordships have received, as I have, a large number of pamphlets and papers on one side or the other of this question. I have done my best to read many of them, and I am bound to say that I have found very few which really seem to me to take a judicial attitude on this question. But in one I did find a passage which I commend to your Lordships' notice—

> "It has always been, and always will be, an impossibility to do true justice without some sympathy."

Now, my Lords, I do not believe that we, or anybody else, can do true justice to those who are interested in the trade in liquor unless we show some real intelligence of, and some sympathy with them, in the difficulties by which they themselves are met and often thwarted.

I venture to say that, in the quarters I have indicated, and in the pamphlets and papers and speeches of those who are aiming at the impracticable object of totally suppressing the liquor traffic, sympathy is wholly absent. Facts are ignored, and the difficulties of the conditions under which this trade must always be carried on are almost altogether lost sight of. Some of these difficulties are inherent in the circumstances. Others, I am afraid I must say, have actually been caused very often by the very legislation which is intended to mitigate the evils at which the legislation was aimed, and it is not fair to imply that the trade is wholly responsible for all the evils which have arisen. In some respects they are a cause; in some respects they are the result. But cause and result act and re-act upon one another in such a complicated fashion that it is impossible wholly to separate the one from the other and to say that this is the cause and that that is the result. I associate myself entirely with those who say that while legislation cannot do everything, legislation can do much; and I pin my hope and my faith to enlightened public opinion, which is certainly making way in this country, and which, if it were allowed to have free play, would, in my humble opinion, act upon the trade itself and draw out sympathy from that trade for many reforms which might, with that aid and that sympathy, be carried out much better than in any other way.

It is a rather melancholy fact that almost the whole history of our temperance legislation for the last fifty years has been in the direction of restriction. There has been hardly one Act passed with the main object of enabling licence-holders themselves and those behind them to develop and improve matters in accordance with the enlightened public opinion to which I have referred. One of the greatest difficulties in the present system is the prevalence of what are known as tied houses. Up to a certain point tied houses make for discipline and good conduct, but, on the other hand, they undoubtedly have the effect of putting a premium upon the sale of intoxicating liquors as opposed to all other kinds of refreshment; and it is my sincere opinion that if this Bill were to be passed as it stands—recommended as it is by many people who think that, it would tend to increase temperance — there would be little hope of improvement in the direction I have just indicated during the reduction or the compensation period. I say so for this reason, that, owing to the terms in which the Bill is framed, you would, amongst other evil results that you would bring about, put upon licence-holders and others interested in licensed property the absolute necessity of squeezing out of their property everything in profit they could from intoxicating liquor. That is in itself a great evil. But if you go upon the other policy which I see sometimes foreshadowed, which is known, roughly, as that of high licence, I believe you will be doing for true temperance reform one of the worst turns it is possible for legislation or administration to do, because again it would place the premium which I have indicated upon the licence-holder to do everything for profit and nothing for reform.

It is a commonplace amongst us all that improvement is going on. My plea in regard to legislation is this, that we ought carefully to study in what directions we can do our best to put a premium upon that improvement, to help those whose opinion is enlightened who are doing the best to make things better than they are at the present time. While I am all in favour of legislation which is fully up to—perhaps even a little in advance of—enlightened public opinion, I feel that if you go much in advance of the support which you will get from general public opinion you will undoubtedly do more harm than good. Scotsman though I am, I have had some experience in English matters. May I remind you Lordships, without conceit, that I was chairman of a Welsh Sunday Closing Commission twenty years ago, I was responsible for the English Act of 1902, and the Scottish Act of 1903, and I had an opportunity of learning the arguments on both sides for the Act of 1904, because it passed during the year that I had the honour of acting as Chairman of Committees in your Lordships' House.

The problems are somewhat different in Scotland and in England, and it does not do to draw analogies without much care and consideration between the two countries. But if there is one lesson in Scottish experience which should be of use in England it is this––that whatever you do, do not so regulate your legislation as to put a premium on the substitution of spirits for beer, or of clubs for public-houses. I greatly deplore a condition in Scotland which largely arises from the fact that spirits there, as everybody knows, are much more consumed by the rank and file of the population in proportion to beer than is the case south of the Tweed, and that there the public-house, the well-conducted public-house even, is by no means so much the resort and the club of the respectable working man as it is here. Whatever you do, let me put it to you with all the earnestness of which I am capable—Do not in your legislation do anything which will make it more likely that the great body of the population will have recourse to the drinking of spirits and stronger liquors rather than beer, especially the lighter kinds of beer, and other similar refreshments. Clubs—bad clubs at least—are a greater evil than public-houses. There are good and bad clubs, there are good and bad public-houses. But I venture to say that, even if the clubs to which most of your Lordships and many in a humbler social sphere are accustomed are in themselves good things, some other clubs are very much the reverse, and there is nothing so difficult to regulate, nothing so difficult to interfere with, as a club once it gets a real hold upon the minds and feelings of those concerned.

I ask your Lordships to consider the Act of 1904 in its relation to the proposals in this Bill. I was not altogether an admirer of the Act of 1904. I ventured to say so on the Third Reading of the Bill. I spoke in mild terms—milder than I felt, for this reason. As your Lordships know, it was not very long after the time that on other grounds I had occasion to sever myself from my friends on the front Opposition bench, and I was most anxious that it should not be thought that my adverse comments on the Bill of 1904 had anything to do with other matters. I ventured then to say, and I think still, that the Act of 1904 was a bad bargain for the State. It was not altogether a bad bargain; for it had many redeeming features. It made for the reduction of public-houses, generally speaking, in a wise and moderate fashion. It certainly got rid of the privileged position of the *ante*-1869 beer-houses; but it seemed to me then, and it seems to me still, that in return for those two advantages it gave a greater expectancy of renewal of tenure of the ordinary public-house than was justified, having regard to the whole terms of the decision in the well-known case of *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield*. I venture to say that in some respects the Act has not fulfilled the good intentions of those who promoted it. In particular, the reduction which was promised has been rather less rapid than was hoped, and one great defect, as it seems to me, was that there was no general authority whose business it was to safeguard the fund got together by the compensation levy. A fund of that kind seems to me to require special guardianship in case it is drawn upon in improper and extravagant ways.

The Act of 1904 met with unforeseen, and, I venture to say, undeserved difficulties of another kind. I refer to the points involved in what is known as the

Kennedy judgment. I am the last person to say that that judgment was not in accordance with the law. I am certain that it was, because it was so declared by one of His Majesty's Judges and no appeal was taken; but I have never been able to see that the point involved was a reasonable one to be decided in the way that it was. I am anxious to know whether that point was foreseen, and whether the particular compensation allowed by that judgment was intended by those who promoted the Act. I think that is a perfectly fair question, the point involved being roughly whether brewers' profits were to enter into the calculation for compensation when a particular house was suppressed. The conditions of the Act of 1904, as prescribed in the 5th clause, seem to me eminently reasonable. It was laid down that it was to be the difference between the value of the premises unlicensed and licensed; and there was a distinct instruction to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, who are responsible for administering it, that they were to take into consideration the same principles as were to be considered in matters of estate duty. They did so, and a good many cases were decided without any appeal to the law.

But by-and-by some ingenious person thought that it was possible and lawful to get a calculation in respect of the brewers' profits on beer sold in the house to be suppressed. It does not seem to me, having regard to the whole circumstances, that that was reasonable. I am not challenging the law; I am saying that I do not think it to be reasonable. Supposing there are three public-houses in a place all belonging to a syndicate of brewers, and one of them is suppressed, the expenses, no doubt, are saved of the third one, and the licence-holder has to be compensated, and ought to be compensated, for deprivation of his business on a proper and even liberal scale; but I am sceptical of the belief put forward by the right rev. prelate the Bishop of London, on the authority of one of his brewing friends, that the custom bestowed on the suppressed house altogether evaporates. I believe, on the contrary, that it would go to one of the other houses, and in so far as the question of brewers' profits is concerned, I venture to say that extravagant compensation was given.

I have even stronger evidence than the considerations which I have put before you. I think the action of the trade themselves showed that they did not, at any rate at first, expect that compensation. I have been referred to the annual volumes of licensing statistics for the three years, 1905, 1906 and 1907, and a friend of mine who knows more about this matter than I do puts the point to which I wish to call your Lordships attention in these words—

> "Can it be thought that the trade did not know the value of its own houses before the Kennedy judgment? Yet in some 200 cases the trade asked and got from various compensation authorities sums which worked out at about £600 a house. These were their own figures agreed with the authorities, and not referred to the Inland Revenue. Other cases out of the same batch of extinctions—namely, those which took place in the year 1905—were not agreed with the authorities, were referred to Inland Revenue, were held over till after the Kennedy judgment and came out at an average of over £1,300. Other instances are to be found of the differences in the trade's own valuations before and after the Kennedy judgment."

These are very remarkable facts, and they seem to me to afford a strong *prima facie* case for a wise, just, and judicious revisal of the terms of the Act of 1904, as interpreted by Lord Justice Kennedy.

When I turn to the Bill under discussion the terms proposed are rather different, and I am bound to say I do not think a case has been made out for their fairness. The noble Earl the Leader of the House on this point hardly said anything more than that he regarded the terms as liberal. He did not argue it out, and he did not, in particular, tell us why what is described as personal goodwill should not be made a subject of compensation. If a man is dispossessed of his lawful trade surely you are bound to give him full and fair compensation, and in calculating the compensation you must, as the noble Viscount, Lord St. Aldwyn, said the other evening, take into consideration the profits under Schedule D as well as the value under Schedule A. When property of any kind is taken for public purposes you ought to give its full value, that is, as I say, its market value; call it what you like; some would add something for the compulsory taking, even in arbitration. I do not ask for that. The point I put to the Government is this. Successive Governments have for years been valuing public-house licences for estate duty on certain terms. Let us assume that it is a proper valuation. I have never yet been able to understand even the fringe of the argument which justifies the Government from departing from its own valuation when it is proposing to take for its own purposes the very property which it has just valued also for its own purposes. though those are different in degree. That seems to me so clear and so just that I cannot even imagine what the answer is to that particular contention. The noble Viscount, Lord St. Aldwyn, gave a most lucid explanation of the action and reaction upon each other of the compensation during the reduction period and the lime-limit. It seems to me that a great deal of the trouble, apart from the insufficient valuation which I have just mentioned, arises from the difficulty of capitalising properly the annual value to be finally settled; and it seems to me, if you are running reduction on the same scale as this Bill proposes and at the same time give so short a reduction period as fourteen years, that towards the later part of that time it is absolutely impossible that your terms of capitalisation can be fair to the interests which are taken away. I do not labour this point, because it seems to me that this is just the sort of thing it is impossible to argue effectively on Second Reading. My plea is that it would have been reasonable and right to have allowed the Bill to go into Committee. While in favour of a reasonable and well-thought-out scheme of reduction, I do not think that any case has been made out for the particular Schedules dealing with the ratio of population to public-houses contained in the Bill. Even the Government themselves admit the difficulty, because the Schedules are crowded with exceptions. It seems to me that the exceptions are bound to be so numerous that it is hardly worth while to put in a scale of that kind. It would be much better to leave the question for treatment by a well-constituted, thoroughly informed, and judicial body of local justices.

We often hear it said that this Bill is a compromise. Of course, it is a compromise; at least it is an intermediate stage between those who want total confiscation and those who want rather larger terms of valuation. I think that in its terms the Bill undoubtedly goes somewhat in the direction of confiscation. I wonder if your Lordships have ever heard of the story of Mr. Abraham Lincoln and his wife. I came across it in a volume of reminiscences the other day. It seems there was a discussion between them as to whether their house should be painted white or brown. He said white, she said brown. The discussion raged rather high, but a few days afterwards Mr. Lincoln said to a friend that they had come to a compromise. "Oh, and what is the compromise?" said the friend. "The house is to be painted brown," was the reply. I venture to think that in the scale of compensation the Government have leant too much to the side of confiscation and that there is not much of a compromise in the matter, at any rate as it now stands.

I turn for a moment to Clause 26. the clause which deals with what is known as monopoly value. I say respectfully that that clause is amazing to me, both in its history and in its contents. It will not run with Clause 10, which is the compensation clause. It ought not to be exactly the same, I agree. The precise factors you have to get at for future monopoly value and those for present compensation are not the same; but, if these two clauses are compared, it will be seen that it is absolutely impossible that they can both be right. If the compensation clause is right the monopoly value is too little. There is no distinct ratio between the two. That is exactly the sort of point with which we ought to have got to closer quarters in Committee. As to the history of the clause, I believe I am right in saying that the particular terms of it were only placed on the Notice Paper in the other House on the morning that they were to be discussed, and that they passed without adequate discussion and without adequate scrutiny. Now that is the very way to lay pitfalls and snares and traps for Parliament and its intentions, just as was done by the Act of 1904. Clause 26 in this Bill demands most careful scrutiny and most ample consideration. But it will not become of real importance until twenty-one years hence. It is of some importance at present, no doubt, because it is a guide to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and public authorities in the case of new licences, but that is, relatively speaking, a small matter. I should have been prepared to trust to a large extent to the authorities in the matter of new licences, because, after all, it is a question of option for a man if he wants a new licence whether he will take it on the terms offered to him; but it is a very different thing to say that these are the terms on which in future, twenty-one years hence, you shall have your licence if you have it at all. Is it not without precedent that one Parliament should seek to bind another in this way twenty-one years ahead? There will be in the natural course of events, and taking the average life of Parliaments, at least four general elections between now and then. How can you attempt to forecast what will be fair, right, and in accordance with sound and enlightened public opinion in a matter of this kind twenty-one years off?

I pass from that point. I deliberately say nothing in detail upon those provisions of the Bill which are known as the temperance provisions. I share the view which has been expressed by some of your Lordships that many of these provisions are extremely valuable. I specially instance the one which has been found of the greatest use in Scotland—the restriction upon the sale of liquor by means of vans throughout the country districts. That was a clause of my own in the Act of 1903. I know it has done the greatest good in Scotland, and I believe it to be capable of enormous good to the country populations in England. I also wish to say a word upon Clause 22 which increases, in my humble opinion in a wise and proper manner, the jurisdiction and discretion of the local justices. I think it is of the utmost importance that in the renewal of licences the justices should have a wide discretion as to the conditions which they will impose on the holder

I am not going at length into the question of clubs. They require regulation, and I believe that the proposals in this Bill are, in the main, sound. I would have liked, however, to have had an opportunity of criticising them in Committee. The proposals as to Sunday closing, the shutting of public-houses on polling days, the presence of children at bars of public-houses, and the *bona fide* traveller, contain at any rate most valuable reforms; and my regret is that these questions have not been embodied in a legislative measure which did not contain other provisions arousing extreme controversy. I hope that a Bill of that kind may be produced. I would give it my most careful consideration, and probably my most earnest support. But would it not have been of advantage to pass the Second Reading of the Bill even if you drastically altered some of its clauses in Committee? By taking this course your Lordships would have been enabled to show to the public the character of the provisions which you were willing to pass in the interests of temperance. I would have been most anxious to show, in a concrete form, what it was that the House was willing and anxious to do in the great cause of temperance reform.

I am told that it would be impossible on two grounds to follow the course which I would like to have seen taken. I am told by my friends that there would be no hope of His Majesty's Government agreeing to the changes, in some ways the drastic changes, which I want to see made, and that, therefore, we should still lose the Bill. At any rate I should like to have tried. However enthusiastic the Ministerial cheers which my last sentence elicited may be, I admit that some of the past actions of the Government make the course I recommend very difficult for noble Lords on this side of the House. We have tried our hand at amending various Bills, but we have not met with much encouragement either on the part of His Majesty's Government or their supporters. I have not time—and it is not germane to this discussion—to analyse the causes, but the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture let us in a little behind the scenes some time ago. In one of his very candid speeches, to which we always listen with so much pleasure, he told us that he could not do certain things in his first Agricultural Holdings Bill because some of the supporters of the Government in another place were such terrible fellows that the Government could not control them and must give way to them. Briefly put, that is a paraphrase of what the noble Earl said even in regard to a particular provision in that Bill, which he, on behalf of the Government, had accepted in this House. Therefore I know that the course which I would like to have seen taken on this Bill is fraught with great difficulty.

I am confronted also with the question of privilege. I am the last person to say a word which could in the remotest way be held to criticise the action of the Speaker of the House of Commons. His action is guided, and rightly guided, by what he thinks is the privilege of that House and by his duty to the House to which he owes so much. We here are not bound by that decision. It is a commonplace in this matter, but a commonplace which is too often forgotten, that each House is the guardian of its own privilege; and I look with the utmost dislike and apprehension to the way in which this question of privilege is being extended. I have much more fear of that way of weakening this House than all the resolutions and actions of the Government opposite. But I would like to have waited until the question of privilege arose, to see whether it would be claimed on this Bill. Those who argue on that line are bringing about the very thing they dislike, having precedents piled up against us in this matter.

Where can privilege come in in this Bill? I venture to say that except in Clause 26, which touches the monopoly value, there is not a provision or a point in which privilege can fairly be claimed by the other House. It cannot come in in regard to the compensation levy; those are not public funds, but are drawn from private sources. I do not like to say anything at which the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition could possibly take offence; but I say, with all respect, that we on this side look to him to support and to advocate the claims of this House in the matter of privilege, and not in anticipation, and without due cause, to say that privilege exists. There is an old adage that you should never say "Good morning" to the devil till you meet him. I do not want to have the question of privilege raised until it is absolutely necessary. Anyhow, I would rather have lost this Bill on a contention about privilege than have it rejected on Second Reading. Privilege could have been waived if necessary, and I think that if you had cut out Clause 26 altogether you would have evaded the question of privilege and would not have materially altered the Bill. I will not carry that matter further, because I am under the strongest obligation to many of my friends to confine my remarks within as short a space of time as I possibly can.

Now I come to the main point of difference between myself and the majority of those with whom on ordinary occasions I am proud to act. I have admitted the force of much that can be said against this Bill as it now stands. I say, as strongly as anyone on these benches can say, that as it now stands it would be impossible for us to pass it. It may be that the Amendments which I should have supported would be so drastic as to have involved the loss of the Bill. If so, the difference between the noble Marquess and myself is one of method, not of principle. I would have greatly valued the educative effect of the discussions which we would have had in Committee. As I have said, I would have liked to show clearly what we are willing to pass and what we are not willing to pass. I would have liked to show the exact form in which we would have been willing to give our adhesion, perhaps even our hearty consent, to many reforms in the interests of temperance. I dislike the possibility of its being alleged that we are putting property in licences, whatever it may be—and I do not undervalue it—on the same level as other kinds of property which have been mentioned. If you draw that parallel too close you do a great disservice to many of the interests which are largely in the keeping of this House. But in all seriousness, and in all good humour, I say that whether you thought the chance of compromise on this Bill small or great, by the action you have taken in previously announcing that you mean to reject it on Second Reading you have made any chance of compromise practically impossible. I believe that even last night, if we could have known how far the Government were likely to go, many waverers on this side would have had their opinions changed. But I frankly admit that in all the circumstances and having regard to the attitude which has been taken, such a voluntary move on the part of His Majesty's Government was made practically impossible.

I am not concerned with the arguments as to the threats that are to be used against this House. My experience is that those who dislike your Lordships' House will never be satisfied with anything that it does. If you take what is called a strong line you will be threatened; if you do not take what is regarded outside as a strong line you will be treated—which is almost harder to bear—with a certain measure of contempt. You cannot please your critics, and my ideas of method are not intended to please those critics. They are formed because I think them right, because I think them for the advantage of this House; and although I say frankly that in presence of the language used by some of the members of His Majesty's Government, the course I recommend is made exceptionally and unduly difficult, yet still, having regard to all the circumstances, I think it would have been a wiser and a more patriotic course to pursue.

Your Lordships think that you are right. You think that the bye-elections are telling in your favour, and that you are, so to speak, on the crest of the wave. It is possible that at the moment, although I mistrust bye-elections, you have a certain majority with you. The trade has conducted a well-organised agitation, and it claims to have been the deciding factor in these bye-elections. Other people claim them for some other causes which they have at heart, and I am not going to attempt to decide between them. But even supposing that this agitation, well organised as it has been, has been as successful as has been claimed, does it in all cases come from those classes on whose support your Lordships would most like to rely? If the Bill is rejected on Second Reading, your Lordships will offend many of those who are otherwise your most ardent friends, and who will view your action with the greatest regret. I say also that the rejection of the Bill on Second Reading is too like a denial of the right of the State to change its policy in this matter of licensing altogether. If I give my vote, as I am afraid I shall have to do, against the Amendment proposed by the noble Marquess, and therefore practically in favour of the Second Reading, I do not vote for all the provisions of the Bill as they stand; I do not even vote for a reduction of public-houses as in itself the aim and end of all things; but I give my vote because I earnestly desire to recover for the State its unfettered discretion to deal with all the interests which have been allowed to grow up, as I think, to the detriment, if not to the disaster, of the national well-being.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE: My Lords, I rise to support the Amendment moved by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition. I consider that this Bill assails two of the most sacred principles of our Constitution—the security of property and the liberty of the subject. All questions of property are thrown aside in this Bill. To do good at other people's expense is to my mind, at best, a dubious policy. The noble Lord who has just sat down referred to recent bye-elections. It seems to me that the recent bye-elections clearly indicate that we in this House would be failing in our duty if we did not recognise the very emphatic and reiterated requests that have been made to us to reject this Bill.

It is a very remarkable circumstance that the popularity of the present Government only began to wane, as is shown by the bye-elections, with the looming on the political horizon of the Licensing Bill. In 1906, though there were eight bye-elections, the Government only lost one seat—the Cockermouth division of Cumberland, which they attributed to the fact that a third candidate was in the field. In 1907 there were no fewer than eleven bye-electors, but the Government only lost one seat. Then in 1908 came first the shadow and then the substance of the Licensing Bill, with the result that the bye-elections in Mid-Devon, in the

Ross division of Hereford, in Worcester, and in Hastings, showed large majorities against the Government; and at South Leeds the Conservative poll was increased from 2,126 to 4,915. The first bye-election fought mainly on the Licensing Bill was undoubtedly that of Peckham, which, as is well-known, resulted in the absolute rout of the Ministerial forces, the Radical majority of 1,427 being converted into a Conservative majority of 1,746. At Dewsbury a Minister who sought re-election owing to promotion to Cabinet rank had his poll reduced from 6,764 to 5,594, while the Conservative vote was very largely increased. Then Mr. Winston Churchill was turned out of North-west Manchester, his opponent fighting mainly on the Licensing Bill; and at East Wolverhampton the Radical majority of over 2,000 was reduced to eight. The bye-election in the Newport Division of Shropshire showed an increase in the Conservative majority from 166 to over 900. Then came the Pudsey bye-election in Yorkshire. Sir Thomas Whittaker is the member for the neighbouring division of Spen Valley, and he worked throughout that election to make the Licensing Bill attractive. The result, however, was the loss of the seat to the Radicals. In August, when the Haggerston bye-election took place, Clause 1 of this Bill had been discussed in Committee. The result of that election was the return of a Conservative in place of a Liberal. Finally, there was the Newcastle bye-election, which resulted in a great reduction of the Liberal vote.

All in your Lordships House will agree, I think, that one of our fundamental functions is to interpret the true and well-considered will of the people. Have we ever had a plainer intimation as to the view of the people of this country than that given by the recent bye-elections? These elections have been fought in different parts of the country and in every sort of constituency, and in many instances the defeats of Liberal candidates have been acknowledged to be due to the feeling against the Licensing Bill. I have no hesitation in saying that the county of Kent, from which I come, is absolutely against the Bill, which is there regarded rather as an instrument of gross injustice than as a measure of temperance, more especially when the light in which the Socialists look upon it is considered. There is no doubt, too, in my opinion, that the Bill has accentuated to a very large degree the evils of unemployment. For these reasons I shall support the Amendment of the noble Marquess.

*Lord BURGHCLERE: My Lords, I shall not follow the noble Viscount who has just spoken into the statistics he has given of recent bye-elections, for two reasons—first, because I have had some personal experience of bye-elections during the last twenty-five years and have never known any Government deterred by defeats at bye-elections from bringing in important measures to which they were pledged; and, secondly, because I am aware that your Lordships wish as speedily as possible to get to the division. I propose to state as shortly and succinctly as I can, the reasons which compel me to vote against the Amendment moved by the noble Marquess opposite and in favour of the Second Reading of the Bill. Those who support this Bill are handicapped by the fact that they address your Lordships with, so to speak, a halter round their necks, and that their eloquence, however Ciceronian, is thrown away upon minds already made up.

The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition the other day criticised my noble friend the Leader of the House for some observations he made regarding a certain meeting "in a famous house in a famous square." I admit—it is an obvious truism—that every party leader has a right to call his followers together for consultation regarding measures coming before Parliament. I myself remember the meeting called with regard to the Home Rule Bill by Mr. Gladstone in 1886; I was there myself, but I venture to think there is a considerable difference between that meeting and the meeting in Lansdowne House. The meeting of 1886 was called by the leader of a party whose majority and power ebbed and flowed with the will of the people. In the other case, it was a meeting of a party with a permanent majority in this House, whether that party possesses the confidence of the country or not; and surely it is a matter of great regret that such a meeting should resolve to reject, and to reject summarily, a measure passed by an overwhelming majority in the Assembly elected by the people. Surely under such circumstances it would have been wiser and more in accordance with precedent to have given an opportunity for the discussion in this House in Committee of a measure supported by so overwhelming a majority in the House of Commons.

I have always understood that the debate on the Second Reading of a Bill was a debate on its principle, not on its details. Now what are the principles of this measure? No one can have listened to the speeches that have been made without recognising that the bedrock principles of this Bill are principles on which the House is unanimous, for noble Lords opposite, by the terms of their Amendment, admit that they are in favour of those principles. The Amendment declares that the Bill would not materially advance the cause of temperance, but the use of the word "materially" is a qualification of statements often made that the Bill does not in any way promote the case of temperance, and it is to be taken as an admission that it does in some measure do that which its supporters claim for it. Yet noble Lords opposite support the rejection of the Bill on Second Reading.

That the Bill would cause inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects I admit, but my noble friend the Leader of the House in his speech the other evening pointed out in the most convincing terms that it was quite impossible to bring forward any measure of progress in any way affecting a trade or section of people without causing inconvenience to someone. Take motor cars, for instance, if it is permissible to compare small things with great ones. It cannot be said that the introduction of motors, the running of which upon the roads has been sanctioned by the Legislature, has not caused inconvenience to a great many of His Majesty's subjects. Moreover, it has done absolute harm to coach-drivers, hostlers, and other people connected with horse-drawn vehicles. I have tried in vain to find out who are the particular subjects referred to in this Amendment who will be occasioned great inconvenience by this Bill. It may be our old friend the *bona fide* traveller. It is true that under the Bill the *bona fide* traveller will have to walk six instead of three miles for alcoholic refreshment; but at the end of the three miles he can have a sandwich and some lemonade, which will give him strength to trudge the other three miles when he can obtain a whiskey and soda. But that is a Committee point, and therefore I can hardly believe that it can be brought forward as a reason for rejecting the Bill on Second Reading. Then the Amendment goes on to declare that the Bill will "violate every principle of equity."

LORD ASHBOURNE: Hear, hear.

*LORD BURGHCLERE: I am sorry to hear that cheer. Accustomed as we are to the use of strong language in party controversy, I regret that such terms should be used in this connection, for they cover an accusation against not only party rivals, but grave and reverend persons who do not often take part in political discussions—archbishops, bishops, great Nonconformist divines, leaders in Christian and social reforms; and if those who have drawn up this Bill are convicted of such conduct as is imputed to them, they have sinned in very good company. Whatever I thought of the Bill I certainly could not vote for this Amendment, and if I sat on the other side of the House I should prefer giving a simple negative to the Motion for the Second Reading to recording my vote for an Amendment couched in these terms.

In my humble judgment the whole question at issue is, in the words of Mr. Balfour in his Albert Hall speech, whether it is an honest measure and likely to prove effective. I do not hope to convince noble Lords opposite, but I firmly believe that this is both an honest and an efficient measure in the direction of remedying the evils of intemperance. It is an efficient measure for the reason that it reduces the number of licences. That it is necessary to reduce the number of licences is a principle affirmed by the Peel Commission and all advocates of temperance reform; it was a principle upon which the Act of 1904 was supported. The promise held out in the debates on the 1904 Act was a reduction of 2,000 or more annually. In the result the utmost reduction in a year has been something over 1,000, and that will, of course, in the future be a diminishing quantity. The present Bill provides for a compulsory reduction of 2,200 a year, so that at the end of fourteen years the total reduction would amount to 30,000. It is obvious that if the Bill does that, it is, at any rate, a step in the direction of temperance reform.

The noble and learned Lord opposite cheered the statement that the Bill will "violate every principle of equity." On what is that charge founded? Is it founded on the assertion that the licence-holder has a permanent interest in the licence, that he is in equity, if not in fact, a freeholder? The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition told us that a licence-holder was not a freeholder, but something more than a tenant at will. What the noble Marquess means is that he has an expectation of renewal. But legally, by the Act of 1828, a licence is for a year and no longer. The noble and learned Earl opposite, Lord Halsbury, objected to his utterances as a Judge being quoted. I will give his utterances as a politician on this point. In the debate on the Bill of 1904 he used these words—

> "That there is no legal right for the continuance of a licence, nobody in his senses, I think, has ever contended."

The speech of the noble Earl on the cross benches, Lord Rosebery, last night proved that monopoly value belongs to the State. What, then, does this charge of dishonesty mean? I would recall the fact that in 1879 a Committee of your Lordships' House was appointed to consider the causes of intemperance. Now, our position to-day is that the monopoly value has been entirely created by the State and can be resumed by the State for the benefit of the nation after due and fair notice. What said the Committee of your Lordships' House in 1879—a Committee appointed by a Conservative Government and largely composed of Conservative Members—on the Acts of 1869 and 1872—

> "The effect of this legislation has been largely to raise the value of this property, and it would seem but just that the public should receive a greater proportion than hitherto of the profits of a monopoly thus artifically created."

And the Government are now denounced as confiscators for acting on this recommendation thirty years after, and delaying the operation of the principle for a further twenty-one years! I know that my voice carries no weight in this House. If it did, I would ask, even at this last moment, whether there is no chance of a compromise and a fair settlement of the question. I am afraid there is none, and that to-night when the division takes place the doom of this Bill will be sealed. Should that be so, the Opposition may achieve a party triumph, but they will at the same time destroy the highest aspirations of some of the best men in the country—the leaders of the Christian churches and the foremost advocates of moral and social reform.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, the noble Lord who has just sat down seemed extremely anxious that speakers on this side should accuse the Government of being dishonest, and should be unwise enough to make an attack on the right rev. bench for their intentional support of a dishonest measure. I am not going to be lured into using harsh language. The best men in the world may sometimes wander into unwise paths, which lead to injustice. I pass by subsidiary points. What stands out in bold relief is this, that the great object of the Bill is to bring about a diminution in the number of public-houses. I recognise that that is an object which statesmen might worthily put before themselves, and to a substantial extent I am prepared to support it. The noble Lord was inaccurate in his reference to the diminutions that have taken place under the Act of 1904. There have been a considerable number, running to nearly 2,000 in one year; but the Government have stopped the borrowing contemplated by the Act to enable compensation to be paid, and that has, of course, largely checked the diminution. But I pass that by as a small matter.

If a diminution in the number of public-houses is a legitimate object to aim at, then I say it should be accomplished on fair and just terms. Put shortly, the great objection to the method proposed in this Bill is that it would work out unfairly and unjustly. This works out in practice so unjustly that your methods amount almost to confiscation. That is a broad objection, but it is at least an intelligible one. You have no right to reduce the number of public-houses in order to carry out temperance reforms unless you do it fairly. If you take away the property of anyone you must pay for it, and then you will be doing something that is arguable and defensible. At the present moment, public-houses are entitled, if sold in the open market, to the market value. Does anyone say that that is an unreasonable proposition? If any man has a certain property, whether it is a licence, an expectation, land, or anything else, not being a freehold, which is worth in the market perhaps thousands of pounds, it is not reasonable to take away that property and pay only about one-fifth of its real market value. Several right rev. Prelates have spoken, and so has my noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh, but not a single speaker so far who has spoken in favour of this Bill has examined its vulgar details. The position is that at present a man finds himself in possession of something which can be sold in the market, and, for certain purposes, its value is assessed by the Government at its real market value. How can it possibly be regarded as just to take away that property, paying for it only one-fifth of its true market value? It is not reasonable to use all these platitudes about temperance, and, at the same time, shut your eyes to the reality of things. The noble Earl who leads the House said there was a difference between the compensation paid now to tied houses and untied houses, but I may tell him that that statement is inaccurate, because the value of both tied and untied houses is measured and decided in exactly the same way. The owners in the case of tied houses, I am aware, would be brewers, but in principle and in substance I am informed that there is not a vestige of difference in the way tied houses are examined as to their value as compared with untied houses.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): That may be so, but the point I desired to make was that the result worked out very differently.

LORD ASHBOURNE: That is of a somewhat vague character, but at any rate the market value is the real test in each case. I suppose the noble Earl means that the market value is affected by what they see and what they know is the position of the house. People talk about the Kennedy judgment, but the present law officers were counsel in that case. They heard it all discussed, and there was no question raised by them as to whether the true principle had not been correctly laid down as to market value, and it was only a squabble as to the number of years purchase. At any rate the principle was not challenged; in fact, it was conceded, and I ask your Lordships to consider this overwhelming fact in coming to a decision upon this measure. There was no appeal taken from the Kennedy judgment, which was accepted as accurate law; therefore I take it as indisputable that, under the present law, a public-house is entitled to be compensated at its market value. My noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh has drawn a contrast between the figures given before and after the Kennedy judgment. But what is the explanation of those figures? They are explainable in the readiest possible manner. In the first instance, when the Act of 1904 was applied, the worst houses were selected to have their licences withdrawn. Surely that is an immediate explanation of the difference in the prices, if any explanation is necessary. How are we to estimate the value? I do not want to enter further into topics which have been discussed, but we cannot estimate the value as a freehold. The noble Earl Lord Rosebery says the nearest analogy is that of the squatter, but surely that comparison is grotesque and absurd, because the two things are not on the same level in the slightest degree. What a publican possesses in his licence is not a freehold but an entity, a something to which has been attached an expectation of an indefinite renewal, and the market value of that entity is something which can easily be estimated.

My noble friend the Marquess of Lansdowne said in his speech that an analogy could be found in Ireland, and I may add that you have to look to Ireland to learn a great many things. The Ulster custom had no foundation in strict law, but nevertheless they had practice, equity, and usage, and all those things were recognised by Mr. Gladstone in the Act of 1881 as having the force of law. You may push the analogy of the Irish land laws even further. What is a tenancy from year to year? A yearly tenancy is something which can be determined by a very moderate number of years purchase, and yet Mr. Gladstone, when considering the usages and practice in this matter from year to year, gave them a duration of fifteen years renewable for ever. They were not torn aside from the great considerations of usage, practice, and habit of expectation by the existence of the technical legal custom, and Mr. Gladstone on that occasion dealt with the reality of things. It is said that in this Bill there is a time-limit and compensation, and that you are not doing anything unfair. I think it was Mr. Haldane who said, "You have a limit of fourteen years during which you will be certain of your business," but is that so? I believe that statement has deceived thousands of people. I could understand you saying, "We give a time-limit of adequate duration; you must try and save yourselves as best you may, and prepare for the evil day," but that is not what you do. You lay down that one-third of the licences must go, and no man can tell when he may find himself in the scheduled houses. Where is there any certainty in that? Then, again, you deduct from them the insurance levy, and a most extraordinary levy it is. You do not give them any certainty. On the contrary, you simply say that one-third of them must go. You simply tell them that, whether they like it or not, you are going to extract from them a big insurance rate which, by the way, does not insure their own lives. No business man talking sense can say that the time-limit, in its duration or in its conditions, affords anything like compensation—it is almost a farcical use of the term—for the value of the property you are taking away.

There is another point which I should like to make before I sit down. The most rev. Primate said he would like to give generous terms. Everyone who knows that distinguished prelate is aware he would like to do that, and so would every bishop sitting on the bench opposite. I am sure not one of them would like to do anything which by a hair's breadth might be regarded as unfair. I do not know what the reason is for the present attitude of the bishops, but it may be that they have not examined the Bill very closely. But I am not pleading for generous treatment; I am only asking for fair terms between man and man, and surely the first condition of fairness would be to hear what these people have to say before you destroy their property. I know of nothing more startling in this Bill than the fact that a man may have his house entered and shut up without being given a hearing for even five minutes. That man may also have the compensation fixed for his property without being heard for even a second. He may have his levy fixed without being able to say a word on the subject; and, lastly, the monopoly value may also be fixed without his being allowed to say a word. I present to your Lordships that view of the case, and I ask you seriously to consider it, and apply it to the case of your own property. How would you like your own property to be taken away from you interfered with, or injuriously affected in any way, and from the beginning to the end of the process not have even the privilege of saying one solitary word? That is a very startling thing. There is no appeal at all in this matter. Let me for a moment contrast this point with the powers given under the Act of 1904. In that Act there is a provision for the diminution of licences, but you will find in it that no public-house is to be removed without the owner having a hearing. Compensation under that Act cannot be fixed without hearing those immediately concerned, and there is an appeal to the High Court as well. These are very important considerations, and I venture to think that they have not found a fitting place in the debates which have taken place in this House. Neither the noble Earl who introduced the Bill, nor the noble Lord who spoke last night on behalf of the Government, came to close quarters with any one of the points I have mentioned. We are all in favour of temperance, and of every legitimate step to secure that end, but you have failed altogether to apply yourselves to the narrow question—are your terms fair and just, or are they so grossly unfair and unjust that they must be regarded as confiscatory and not to be tolerated at all? I venture to think that those points which have not been discussed are well entitled to your Lordships' close consideration. I am quite satisfied with the few observations I have made, drawing attention to matters which I thought had not been adequately presented to your Lordships. To anyone who knows the history of privilege and of intercourse between the two Houses, it is obviously absurd to expect that the House of Commons and the Government would be prepared to recast their entire Bill, and all its broad propositions, on this vital point of the diminution of public-houses and compensation. Therefore, I think that my noble friend who leads the Opposition is entirely right and justified in moving his Motion for the rejection of this Bill.

*LORD KINNAIRD: My Lords, I do not want to give a vote in favour of the Second Reading of this Bill without giving one or two of the reasons which have led me to take that course. It has been admitted on both sides of the House that there are clearly differences of opinion honestly held by those in favour of this Bill, and also by those who are against it. Throughout the discussion which has taken place during the past twelve months, in which some of us have taken part on one side and some on the other, I venture to think these questions have been fairly considered. I find that what the people wish to know is whether the promise given on the introduction of this Bill that it would be a fair measure, giving fair compensation, has been fulfilled or not. The people want to know whether it deals fairly with the interests which have been allowed to grow up, and on all occasions the people I have addressed have listened carefully and quietly to the arguments on this question, no matter which side put them forward. I am afraid that a large number of your Lordships, even after the appeal of the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, will not be inclined to change your opinion, and notwithstanding the admirable arguments put before the House by my noble friend Viscount St. Aldwyn, which all seemed to advocate the passing of the Second Reading, I fear the majority will be inclined to vote against the Second Reading of this Bill; but that we shall see later on. There are one or two points which I think laymen are competent to give an opinion upon. On certain legal points it may be very rash for a layman to criticise what an ex-Lord Chancellor of England or Ireland may say, but there are certain points which have to be considered from a financial point of view. I know it is very difficult to get at some of these details because we hear such contradictory statements. In my study of this matter I have talked the subject over, in common with many of your Lordships, with my friends, and we have discussed together the question of the payment of the death duties as applied to this subject. I should have thought that the matter was fairly clear at the present time. I have consulted able lawyers on this question who are perfectly competent to give an opinion, and they tell me that what they believe to be the law is this—that when a man dies the value of his property is estimated at the date of his death.

Let me take mining shares as an illustration, and I will suppose that a man at his death leaves shares in De Beers mines. I will assume that this man died at the beginning of this year in January, at which time those mining shares stood at about £22, with the expectation that they were going to receive a dividend, as they had hitherto done, because they knew that the dividend was in hand, that it had been earned, and was actually in cash, or its equivalent, in the coffers of the company. The price would have been at the end of January £22, but in order not to overestimate it, I will place the sum at £20. Before probate would have been paid on that property the directors decided, quite within their rights and in the interests of their companies, not to pay the dividend. I believe the result was that those shares went down from £20 to £12 within a week, and I believe they touched as low as ten guineas. Now I an informed that Somerset House would have taken the market value of those shares on 31st January, that being the date when the owner died, in assessing the probate duty to be paid. Now I come to take the case of licensed property. Lawyers tell me that the price upon which probate will have to be paid is the market value at the date of the death of the owner. The practice is that the person to whom the licensed property passes puts in a price, Somerset House puts in another price, and if they cannot come to terms I am told they can go to an arbitrator, and he decides the price. If the property is sold, and if there happens to be any difference between the price realised and that which was estimated, I am told they can get a rebate. This is exactly the case in the next Schedule. I know of the case of a house in the centre of London which was valued, and which had a mortgage upon it of over £22,000. When the property came to be realised it was found that it had been very much over-estimated, and it was sold only a few weeks ago for £13,000. In this case the lawyers are going to claim, and expect to get, a very considerable rebate of duty on that valuation. I cannot, therefore, see that there is any hardship in the payment of death duty on licensed property, and I fail to see that it gives any right to the purchaser of that property to any special dealing under this Bill simply because he happens to have paid death duty on the market price of the property at the time. I think that is a different view of this question from that which has been generally taken. I know it is a very thorny subject, but it is one which your Lordships will agree is being continually raised, namely, that the payment of the death duty in the case of licensed property in the ordinary way gives them some right for special consideration under this Bill.

Another point of which a good deal has been made in these discussions is the flotation of certain debentures and preference shares to which the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Hereford referred. I think he was quite right in his statement that there was during two or three years a very large appreciation of that property. As Lord Ribblesdale told us, he, along with many other prudent people, was advised that it was such a marked appreciation of value that wise people ought to sell a considerable portion of their licensed property. Some people acted upon that and cleared out and others sold a part to secure the enhanced value, and held the other part on the chance that it might get more valuable. They would probably have done better if they had sold out. I would, however, point out to your Lordships that mining securities, house property, and other forms of property, including railway property, has suffered great depreciation in recent years as well as licensed property. As long as we give the fair market value in doing away with the redundancy of licences, we are acting justly, and I think that point is met by the Bill, and is amply provided for. That is why I feel that I shall be quite justified in voting for the Second Reading of this Bill.

There is another matter which has been referred to, although I will not enter into details upon it, more especially in view of the fact that there is no possibility of this Bill passing. With reference to the question of clubs we on both sides, whichever way we are going to vote, agree on the club question, and also on three-fourths of the other points at issue. We all want to bring about temperance, and we want to deal with clubs fairly. We are all certainly agreed upon the point that we do not want to give drinking clubs any advantage over public-houses, and many of us would like to put them on the same footing. I think I may also say that the majority of your Lordships would not object to your own clubs in the West End of London being subjected to the same rules of inspection as those which are contained in this Bill. This is a point which we might have considered if we had gone into Committee.

Then there is the question of grocers' licences. We are all agreed that we want a measure dealing fairly with that question, and largely reducing the number of such licences. This brings me to the point as to whether it is reasonable to throw out this Bill because clubs are not adequately dealt with, and because grocer's licences have been left out. In regard to the arguments which have been used by the Bishop of Bristol, I confess that I should not have drawn from his premises the same conclusion as he did. He has carefully considered the matter and without hesitation he has declared that this is not a temperance Bill. I will not take up your time any further in dealing with questions which for many months past have been fully considered, but I wish to state that, in my opinion, the alterations which might have been carried in Committee in this House would have made this into a workable Bill. I hope that the clauses for the protection of children may still be added to the Childsen Bill. I understand that when that Bill comes up for the next stage there will be a proposal made to put in the Children's Clauses, and I earnestly hope that many of your Lordships will be here and give them your support in the interests of temperance and in the interests of the children. Within a very short time we shall have to record our vote on this important Bill. We shall, I fear, show by a large majority that we do not consider that the interests and the well-being of our people comes before the interests of a vested interest. I honestly believe that this conflict upon which we are entering is one which other countries entered upon long ago and the vested interests have been swept away. It is no new fight. It has been going on in Canada for many years past, and in Australia they have got ahead of the Mother Country in their temperance legislation. In the United States they have shown that while they respect the interests of property, on the other hand there is something higher than that, and the decision given in the Supreme Court of the United States is that the interests and well being of the community come above even the vested interests of the trade.

Some of us had hoped that this Bill was going to remove in this country to a large extent the evils resulting from intemperance, and achieve a reform which had been long enough delayed. We felt that this was important in our competition with foreign countries in our commercial and industrial life. Many of us take a deep interest in our young men, and we see many a young man's life blighted by the increase in the facilities of drinking. We have seen an increase of this evil in connection with our national sports, which many of us love. We have seen an increase in the evil of betting and gambling, and I am afraid a good deal of this takes place in connection with places where intoxicating liquors are sold. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London has reminded us from his unique experience that these temptations exist, and we want to redress and remove them. I can only say that with all my heart I shall vote for the Second Reading of this Bill, although I shall probably be in a minority. I trust that some of your Lordships who at first did not intend to vote for this Bill may, after hearing the speeches of the most rev. Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury, the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, and others, be induced not to record your votes against the Second Reading, because the passing of the Bill will give an opportunity for introducing Amendments and dealing fairly with some of the details of the measure. I believe that the passing of the Bill would have tended to the honour of our country, and would have saved many of those who are exposed to temptation, without being at all detrimental to those who are engaged in an important trade. In conclusion, I wish to thank your Lordships for having listened to these few words, and I hope what I have said will influence some of your Lordships to record your votes in favour of the Second Reading of this Bill.

VISCOUNT HILL: My Lords, I do not feel justified in giving a silent vote on such an important measure as that which is before your Lordships at the present moment. Judging from the speeches which have been made up to the present, it appears to me that the main object of this Bill has been somewhat lightly treated. I understand that when this Bill was first introduced great stress was laid upon its being a true temperance measure. I find through all the speeches delivered up to the present that even the supporters of the Bill have dealt somewhat dilatorily with this point. We have listened to some most excellent speeches from the bishops' bench, but they have all come back to the same conclusion that many of my hon. friends on this side of the House have arrived at—that a drastic diminution of public-houses will not add to the promotion of temperance in this country. This Bill has not been fully discussed in another place and the people of the country have not had a full opportunity of understanding what the drastic measures proposed really mean. In my opinion the proposals which are now before your Lordships go a great deal further in the direction of increasing drunkenness than in the direction of promoting temperance. If we look to history we find as far back as one can trace that wherever drastic prohibition has been brought about the invariable result has been that illicit facilities have sprung up in the place of public-houses. I firmly believe that if this drastic diminution of public-houses is carried out to the extent which the Government desire, they will find that at the end of their time-limit they will have no responsible or respectable publicans left to take their places in the remaining houses. If I read the Bill aright, there is no encouragement whatever for a publican to keep a respectable house in the future, and it is the respectability of a house that will help to increase temperance in this country. On the other hand, I fear that by this drastic reduction, instead of improving public-houses, we shall find springing up in all our large cities and towns, and especially in the metropolis, places which are most undesirable, and of such a character that it will be almost impossible for the police to have any supervision over them. I do not refer to clubs, or *bona fide* working men's clubs, which are one of the best institutions introduced into this country during recent years. I have had an opportunity of observing that wherever these drastic measure are brought to bear drinking dens are invariably sprung upon the public, and these are the very worst kind of places where vice of all kinds originates, because the people who establish them have nothing to lose, and their main object is to make as much as they possibly can out of the liquor they sell. This kind of thing encourages those to drink excessively who otherwise would not be tempted to take more than is necessary. I have seen in the United States of America and also in Canada, where prohibition has been enforced, some of these dens which are the worst kind of places that can possibly be found. The police have the greatest difficulty in observing or finding out where they are situated, because often they are set up in some back premises where there are no windows. Sometimes they are screened off at the back of some tobacconist's, grocer's, or butcher's shop, the last place where a policeman would imagine anything of the kind was going on. My opinion is that this Bill, as brought in by the Government, will rather encourage the springing up of these places for secret drinking.

Viscount Hill.

The noble Earl who leads the House said he did not understand what secret drinking was, and he spoke upon the subject rather lightly by saying that he might class your Lordships as secret drinkers because you drank at home. But secret drinking is not meant in that way. Secret drinking originates in these horrible dens in the slums of our great cities which afford plenty of facilities for their springing up. I object to this Bill very strongly on that point, because I do not think there is any possible chance of driving a man to temperance by legislation. I think all your Lordships will admit that. I would suggest to His Majesty's Government that if they would introduce a Bill such as the measure which has been introduced by my noble friend Lord Lamington, dealing with the reconstruction of public-houses in this country, it would do more for temperance than any drastic measure abolishing licences. Although a man may become degraded by getting drunk, he abominates being seen whilst he is getting into that state, and if our public-houses were made more public, private doors and back doors were done away with, and the whole of the bars or drinking premises made more open to the public, that would go a great deal further towards the promotion of temperance than the drastic measure which has been proposed by the Government. I notice that several speakers have attacked the Act of 1904. They tell us that that Act has not been successful in reducing the number of licences, or, at any rate, that it has not reduced them to the extent which was promised at the time of the passing of the Bill. It has been said more than once that only 1,100 licences have been taken away in one year. According to the annual statistics for 1907 I find that the reduction last year was over 2,000, and that is a great increase of nearly 700 over the total reduction for 1906. Of course, as you reduce licences it stands to reason that the number reduced must decrease, because there are not so many to come in for reduction. I believe that if the Act of 1904 were amended to bring more pressure to bear upon local authorities to carry out the instructions in the Act and fulfil the provisions of its clauses, a great deal more might be done under that Act than is being done at present in the direction of promoting temperance.

It is a fact, no doubt, that drinking has increased considerably amongst the women of this country, but it must be borne in mind that a great deal of that is due to our present legislation. May I point out that one of the licences which this present Bill does not touch in any way is the off-licence, which, to my mind, is one of the biggest curses of this country. I am sure that all those who sit on the bishops' bench will agree with me that it is only since off-licences were granted in this country that drinking has increased among women, because those licences afford every opportunity for people obtaining intoxicating liquors without anybody being aware of the fact. Women can buy intoxicating liquor from their grocer, and have it charged in the bill as groceries, and this is one of the worst ways of being able to obtain liquor that I think there is in this country. The Government do not propose to interfere with off-licences in this Bill. Not only that, but this measure deals very lightly with clubs. A great deal has been said about clubs, but to my mind it is almost impossible to distinguish between the pure *bona fide* club and what you may call drinking clubs unless a proposal is brought in whereby their accounts would have to be made public either once or twice a year to a public auditor. Even then it would be difficult to overcome the difficulty, because there are many clubs in existence to-day—and they call themselves *bona fide* clubs, and I notice some of them are run by supporters of His Majesty's Government, who occasionally take the chair at those clubs—which go so far as to give variety shows on Sunday, and so forth. Those, to my mind, are not *bona fide* clubs, and ought to be severely dealt with by the Government. There are certain working men's clubs in which I take an interest, and I may say that a more respectable kind of club cannot be found in England, even amongst some of our fine clubs in the West End. Such clubs as I refer to are of great assistance to working-men in debating the current topics of the day. If you are going to allow clubs to spring up in the place of public-houses, without proper police supervision, that will be far worse, to my mind, than the present state of our licensing system. My opinion on this point has not been changed in consequence of the debate which has gone on in your Lordships' House for the last two days. My opinion on this point was formed during the passage of the Bill in another place, where, I am sorry to say, it was very little discussed, especially in regard to some of the most crucial points, and some most important Amendments were brought in at the last moment which were not even understood by the Government. The Prime Minister himself, when attacked on those Amendments, said they would be dealt with in your Lordships' House. Those Amendments ought to have been dealt with before the Bill came to us. Your Lordships will no doubt be attacked from the benches opposite for the action you are taking in regard to this measure, but as a humble Member on the back benches I have no hesitation in solemnly declaring my belief that we as a whole are perfectly right in the stand we are taking to-day. The opinion I have gathered from private information throughout the country and from various sources is very strongly against this Bill, notwithstanding the fact that a noble Lord has charged us with being friends of the brewing community and so forth. I put all that on one side. There is a much stronger force than the brewing trade behind those who are desirous of rejecting this Bill on its Second Reading, and they are not only supporters of noble Lords who sit on this side of the House, but many of them are supporters of His Majesty's Government. They are very strong upon this measure, because there is no sign whatever, and no statement has been forthcoming either from the Government or any of their supporters, that there is any intention of proving in any shape or form where the temperance proposals come in within the clauses of this Bill. It is, to my mind, anything but a temperance measure, and for these reasons I feel that I cannot possibly do otherwise than follow my noble Leader, the Marquess of Lansdowne, into the lobby in favour of rejecting this Bill on its Second Reading.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK: My Lords, the noble Viscount who has just sat down has told us, as we have been often told before, that this is not a temperance measure. I should not be sanguine of convincing him upon that point by enumerating the temperance portions of the measure, because I notice they have already been effectively described from both sides of the House, without preventing the repetition of this criticism. I should like if I may to try and show in another way, which is to me far more satisfactory and conclusive, that this is, in a very real sense, a temperance measure of the sort and kind that we chiefly want. The noble Lord who has just sat down and others have made references to this bench, and they have all been courteous and considerate to us in this debate. But I noticed yesterday that there was a certain tendency to regard the debate, on the part of it with which we here are specially identified, as being a kind of discussion between reason and sentiment. It is said that those who favour this measure represent the sentiment, and those on the benches opposite represent the cooler and quieter voice of reason. Now, reason and sentiment are both honourable, but a discussion in which the two are ranged against each other is singularly unsatisfactory and unprofitable. To myself that is not at all the aspect which this question wears. It seems to me that the two sides are guided, not by different parts of our complex nature, but rather by their differences of association. I do not think anybody can have listened to the very able speeches which have come from the other side of the House without feeling that, speaking generally, those who sit there approach the subject, and very naturally approach it, from the side of business and finance. To them it connects itself with all the intricate system of investments upon which our commercial life depends. It is a trade, and they compare it with other trades, and a great part of what "goes up and down in the City" (in Mr. Weller's phrase) is concerned with this question as it is with all other forms of industry. From that side noble Lords opposite approach it, and at that end they take up the matter. Now what is our case? I speak as one who may in some sense claim to speak, not only on behalf of those who call themselves temperance reformers, but also on behalf of those who are practically working for the moral and spiritual benefit of the people. I approach this question from the state of things as I find it existing in our towns, and which is open to the view of anyone who passes through them. I say with little fear of contradiction that the appearance of the working-class parts of London or other towns is in this respect as unsatisfactory as it well can be. I do not mean in the least because of scenes of debauchery or anything of that kind. What I mean is that you have a dull monotonous town of people, who are evidently living a struggling life, not over well-paid, well-fed, or well-clothed. The places which catch the eye of the traveller, which are attractive and are the centres of popular resort, are the places where for private profit spirituous liquors are sold. Such is the first look of the case. But the impression will be confirmed if you go to any of the people who have a right to speak upon this question. If you go to the police, the magistrates, the medical men, the poor law officers, and so on, they will all tell you with one voice that it is from the influence of those houses upon the population that a very great part of the misery which exists comes. It seems to me, my Lords, quite intolerable that this state of things should go on. I believe that a century hence people looking back at this state of things in the town to-day will speak of it as we speak of some of the things which we cannot imagine how our excellent forefathers endured in their time. When we ask what is it that is wrong we are not dealing with the misdoings of this or that house or this or that man. We are not making any charge against this or that class or saying that they are habitually doing what they know to be wrong or anything of that kind; what we do believe is that the system is somehow thoroughly wrong.

When we look into it we find behind the houses which exist in this relation to our population a strong organisation. We find further that that organisation has tightened its grip and organised itself very much in the last few years, and has grown much more compact and powerful. Its influence in its own Press and in the general Press has very much increased, and it has, in fact, become one of the most powerful influences in the country. We find that not the least serious aspect of the matter is that by a process not unnatural, because it has happened in other trades, this business of purveying liquor has connected itself with parts of society quite apart from its own special business and has woven itself in with general financial interests, and has attracted to itself "the widow and orphan" and all those other investors of whom we have heard so much in this debate. I ask you what a thing this is to contemplate, to see this great organisation built up as it is upon the profits of human weakness and upon supplying drink under the most dangerous conditions—I do not think anybody who knows the towns will doubt that; drink is being supplied to those who from their circumstances are most susceptible to its influences because when a man is in distress or hungry he is most tempted to yield to the temptation of something that he thinks will lighten his care or brighten his life. To this class of people who are most accessible, the supply of drink is one of the most dangerous of all temptations for their own and their families' welfare. To this purpose it is that this great organisation directs itself. I do not want to exaggerate in any particular, still less do I desire to slander my neighbour. It is often said the trade is no lover of drunkenness, and I heartily concede that. Drunkenness is troublesome to the trade and brings it into disrepute and so on. But that platitude is in this sense a sophism. Between drunkenness and the innocent glass which refreshes, and which we all wish to see accessible to anyone who wants to drink it, there is an immense mass of drinking which is needless, and which is, from the point of view of the circumstances of those who indulge in it, extravagant and wasteful; it is, I do not hesitate to say, cruel drinking in regard to its results upon their homes, and dangerous as regards their own character. It is upon that class of drinking that this trade must rely for a great bulk of its profits. I am afraid I shall be condemned for taking this extreme line, but I do so with the utmost confidence, because I believe that what we find here is a system that has got to be changed. It is in that sense that we are opposed to the trade. It is almost superfluous to say, but let it be said in justice, that this trade is one which provides for the public life of England as many upright, noble-minded, and generous-hearted citizens as any other trade which the country contains. When I remember the brewers whom I have known I should be unjust and ungrateful if I did not say that. You will often find our clergy saying that they have among their people publicans and publicans' families for whom they have the greatest respect. When we say we are opposed to the trade it is not because we think that all the members of the trade are villains or anything of that kind at all. The reason is, as I have tried, imperfectly perhaps, to remind your Lordships, that it is the general drift and trend of this organisation and the place we have allowed it to take in the social life of this country that has to be seriously considered. Those sitting on this bench or on any other bench, who really wish to consider seriously these matters should ask themselves what force is there capable of really changing this system. Is it possible to find a Parliament with sufficient power at its back; is it possible to find a Government with sufficient force and pluck to take up this subject? When I find that a measure of this kind is brought up by a Government which has certainly not increased its popularity by handling this question; when I find that after it has been said again and again that you will not get a really strong measure of reform through Parliament; when I find that the present Parliament has passed this measure by a great majority, certainly I for one am moved to look at it favourably. I say that that is not sentiment, but it is reason, because it goes down to the first principles of our convictions.

Then you say, what change is it you desire? Probably you are one of those extravagant persons who think they can drive other people into sobriety by abolishing the consumption of intoxicating liquor as being an evil thing. I certainly have never had any such character amongst my own friends. To me teetotalism other than the teetotalism of the man who practises it as a safeguard to himself, or that of a man who practises it as a kindness, charity, and help to others, is not what I favour. Teetotalism in its compulsory forms has always been to me foolish and repulsive. That is not at all what we desire. What we desire—and I will try to keep to this point—is that all this organised and brigaded force of private and pecuniary interest shall not be at the back of the sale of liquor. This is not any exaggerated or unprecedented claim, but one which has been made again and again by many of the most thoughtful writers and thinkers on this subject. They have seen and urged that this trade, though it has its good points in common with other trades, is a case entirely standing by itself. There are horrible and unhappy organisations for vice, and I put them aside at once as simply evil. There are many organisations for trade which only do good and supply us with the things we want. Between these there lies this organisation which comes much too near to the public evils of the life of the country, and which yet is a perfectly legitimate supply of things which are needed by many, and what they ought to be allowed to have under certain conditions. When we are dealing with a case so peculiar we feel that special treatment is needed. We ask that this state of things shall be somehow or other very thoroughly changed so that the whole distribution and the whole manner of distribution, and the whole relation of the distribution to the people shall be altered. Thus we come round to the point where many of your Lordships begin. For we are told that the way is not open, that we have got a great vested interest, and that we must on all principles of justice deal fairly and reasonably with that interest. What does that mean? Does it mean that the nation, if it wants to make a change, and even a searching change, in its own system must buy itself out? References have been made to the case of slavery when the nation paid £20,000,000 to buy out the slave-owners. Is that what you ought to do in this case? I want to speak to you in my simplicity. I want to speak as a simple person, because I represent a great number of other simple persons in the country, and I want you to see how this matter strikes us; and I believe a great number of the public, especially in those classes who are most affected by this question. This system is built up of licences. What is a licence? It is a year's permission, says the technical lawyer, and so also, not in a technical, but in a rhetorical way, says the extreme advocate of prohibition. On the other hand, a licence is said by others in varying tones and with different degrees of hesitation, to be a property, which very possibly in some senses it is. (I believe I am right in saying that the treatment of a licence as property has hardened a good deal of late under the influence of what has happened since 1904 and so on.) Now when I said that I was speaking in my simplicity what I meant was that a long time ago it seemed to me quite plain that for practical purposes a licence was neither a single year's leave to trade nor was it in any full sense a property. It seems to me just as preposterous to call it the one as to call it the other. Taking everything into account, I think it is something entirely between the two, for which we must find some other way of dealing. I believe there are very large sections of English opinion which would endorse that view. You are not to deal with the licence summarily when the year has expired; neither are you to admit a claim that it should be bought out at the full market price of the house with the licence attached. That is equally absurd.

We simple folk look to see what the experts are saying, and we find they say it is quite true that a middle way must be found, and that the best middle way is the efflux of time, that is to say the time-limit. Long ago we followed that course and that is the reason why the most rev. Primate and others are quite firm in their adhesion to the principle of the time-limit. It is argued that like any other property a licence is one of a man's chattels like any other. You may take it from me that it makes no impression on our minds but one of indignation when we are told that we are sanctioning stealing, and that our action is robbery. It seems to us that there is all the difference in the world between one man putting his hand into another man's pocket, and the State, with all its corporate responsibility, undertaking to reform its own system in this most responsible matter and finding out some equitable way of dealing with a licence. Of course we cannot go into the question of the amount or the length of the time-limit, or into such questions as the value of the property. On these points we simple people are at a disadvantage. We do not profess to be able to go into all these calculations which have been lavished so liberally and circulated so freely among your Lordships during the months this controversy has been going on. But we have tried according to our small capacity to look a little into this matter. And it is here that I should just like to express what has been in my mind with regard to the entire fairness of the Bill. My doubt turns on what I may call the double charge which is laid upon the trade or the double loss involved, the loss by the time-limit and the loss involved up to the end of the time-limit by the payments for compensation. I believe as a matter of fact that this is a result of what I think is the deplorable action taken by the trade in the year 1904. I thought it was deplorable that when the justices of this country on a very small scale, and in a very reserved way, began to exercise the discretion they have always been known to possess the trade ran at once to the then Government and said: "Come to our rescue and give us what we have never had, namely, a Parliamentary title, and secure us against these predatory attacks." The Government gave that, but to their honour they gave it with a qualification. They did what the trade asked for as regards the Parliamentary title, but they said: "You must pay a price for it." I am a little tempted to say that they "robbed" the trade according to their own principle by making the trade compensation which, if the trade possessed a property like other property, ought to have been paid out of the public Exchequer. The result was that we had that reduction system going on, and what I suppose to have happened —though I quite admit that I am now leaving the ground which simple folk ought to occupy—is that when the present Government determined to go deeper, and by the employment of the time-limit to secure in the not distant future the larger change, it was impossible for them as reformers to knock off those reductions which their predecessors had set going, and so the two methods were combined. But I am a little tempted to regret that they not only did that, but they also strung up the compensation payments very considerably, and raised to a very heavy figure the burdens thus entailed upon the trade during the expiring time-limit. But I noticed that it was precisely here that the Prime Minister in the House of Commons came in with a concession which we should have thought was a real and good one and which I thought would have met the point, namely, a concession of seven years. It was not very wise to allow that to be tarnished and damaged by the unlikely prospect of local option during the seven years. It is this combination of two methods which looks to me a little unfair, and to be the strongest point against the Government's proposals and I should have liked to have seen this point dealt with thoroughly in Committee. But then I must say that as far as the case for the Opposition has been carried no distinct stress has been laid upon that point. Very likely I may have overlooked something, but it was only when

Lord Belper was speaking, in a very thin House, that I heard it quite distinctly brought out as the real sting and fault of this Bill. In other speeches it may have been mentioned, but I think it was lost sight of in that general attack upon property which in that form does not appeal to the minds of many of us at all. That is the reason why most of us on this bench are going to give a vote for this Bill which is a cordial vote upon the whole question, but if I may say so without offence is a more unreserved and decided vote against the line which is taken on the benches opposite. We feel that the property argument has been pushed to the full and has been pushed too far, and it stands as a hindrance, and an illegitimate hindrance, across the path which leads to that real change in the system which would enable the retailing of liquor to be conducted not in the way that private interest suggests, but in the way which the nation in its wisdom may find to be the most appropriate. That is what stands in the way of the change we desire. I have tried to show to your Lordships that we take this course not on grounds of sentiment but on what we think are grounds of sober and practical reason. Lord Ribblesdale said on the first night of the debate that those who were sitting on the benches opposite would be doing a popular thing by rejecting this Bill, and he commended this view to those who were strongly in favour of it and who did not fear public opinion. I have always observed that there are several public opinions in this country, and there are certainly several ways of acquiring popularity. I cannot think that this House, for whose honour I feel very jealous, as I think every Member of it must feel, will find that it has appealed to the best forms of public opinion in the country by the action it is taking; and that the popularity which it gains, if it does gain, is not the popularity of those who, setting aside all private interests and partial affections, set themselves to the consideration of what they regard as best for the moral welfare of the nation.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I have two grounds for wishing to take part in this debate. The first is that, having been engaged for some years in temperance work in connection with the trust movement, I realise the very great need which exists for many of the reforms put forward in this Bill. On this matter I do not take my opinion from the most rev. Primate or from the episcopal bench, or from any other persons. I speak from my own knowledge and experience. Secondly, since that work has taken the form of carrying on a public-house business under the existing law, I have had ample opportunity of realising some of the great difficulties which attend a business of this kind; and also of appreciating the effect which this Bill, if passed, would have upon the trade. I hope that no one will accuse me of being hostile, either politically or fanatically, to the trade, and I hope that your Lordships will not see upon my face what my noble friend Lord Robertson described as the scowl of the teetotal fanatic which he seemed to trace upon the face of the draughtsman of this Bill. In a sense, I am myself engaged in this trade, and I cannot in any way approach it with feelings of hostility. Being engaged in that trade I know it is not the entirely evil thing, and certainly not the extremely lucrative business, which many temperance reformers believe. There are two great questions which are raised both by the Bill, and by the Amendment before the House. In the first place there is the question of temperance, and in the second place the question of justice or equity. If the Bill is defended it must be defended upon both those grounds, and I desire, so far as I can under the present circumstances, to deal with both those aspects of the question. I will deal with the question of justice or equity in the first instance, because I think that aspect of the question has occupied by far the largest part of the speeches made on this side of the House. I do not complain of that. I think it is only right, because, however great may be the moral purpose of a Bill like this, we have to look not only at its objects, but also at the methods by which those objects are to be carried out; and whatever may be the extent of the public good which a Bill of this sort seeks to obtain, I should be the last person to suggest that we should achieve public good at the cost of private wrong. The whole question we have to consider is what is just and equitable as between the State on the one side and the private trader on the other. But the interests of the State must not be overlooked. I was very much surprised to hear the noble Earl, Lord Halsbury, say last night that he did not know what was meant when people talked of the rights of the State, and that, in his opinion, no such rights existed. I do not know what other people may mean when they speak of the rights of the State, but what I mean by the right of the State is the right to consider the whole question of licensing from the point of view of the public interest. By that I mean the right of the licensing authority not only to grant licences but also to take them away, to say what conditions shall attach to them, what price shall be paid for them, under what conditions and circumstances a licensed business shall be carried on; a perfectly free and unfettered discretion, if need be, to take away the licence of one person and give it to another. That is what I mean by the right of the State. That liberty does not exist at the present moment, and it is the object of this Bill to restore it.

The Act of 1904 took care to make ample provision for the rights and interests of the private trader, but it did not have sufficient regard for the rights of the State. On the other hand, this Bill seems to me to err in the other direction. In this Bill great care is taken of the rights of the State but not sufficient consideration is given—I do not say no consideration but insufficient consideration is given—to the rights of the private trader. On the question of equity we have had two very weighty speeches, one from the noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, and the other from the noble Viscount, Lord St. Aldwyn, and although I do not agree entirely with their premises I do agree with both of them in thinking that the compensation clauses of this Bill require some amendment. If I may say so, the speech of the noble Viscount was not only a very moderate, but an extremely powerful speech. I think it was the most powerful speech which has been yet directed against the Bill, and so far as I am aware, the arguments which he brought forward have not yet been met. In that speech the noble Viscount attacked the Government because they had substituted the Schedule A basis of valuation for the assessment of compensation for the market value basis set up in the Bill of 1904. The noble Viscount drew an analogy between the business of a grocer or draper and that of a publican, and he asked what would be thought in the case of a grocer or a draper if, when his business was taken away from him, you offered to compensate him upon the Schedule A value of that business. I cannot help thinking that these analogies are very misleading. We have had a great many analogies drawn in the course of this debate, of one kind and another, and I do not think that in a single instance the analogy has absolutely fitted the case. Certainly the noble Viscount's analogy was not happier than others, because there is no real comparison between the business of a grocer or draper carried on under free competition, in the open market, and the strictly monopoly business of a licence-holder carried on under a licence from the State. The mistake which the noble Viscount made, if I may say so with all respect, was to speak of compensation for profits. He said: "I challenge the noble Earl, or any of his colleagues, to show how it is possible under Schedule A to compensate a man sufficiently for the loss of his profits." When a man is compensated for the loss of his licence, under the law as it stands to-day, you compensate him not for his business or profits, but for the loss in the market value of his premises owing to the fact that the licence has been taken away from them. I am speaking upon a matter of law, and if I am mistaken I hope I shall be corrected. I think the position is that when the State gives a licence to particular premises it gives to the owner an opportunity of doing a profitable business which has a marketable value, and when the licence is withdrawn that additional value which is given to the premises by the licence is what the State takes away. The only thing which is under consideration when compensation is contemplated is the enhanced value given by the licence, and a man is compensated under the law for the difference in the value of his premises with a licence and without a licence. That is a very different thing from the profits of a business. It is not the business which the State takes away or for which it compensates, because, in the case of licensed premises the business is not the business of the owner of the house but that of the publican. If the analogy of the noble Viscount were really applied strictly the grocer in the circumstances would receive no compensation because there is no difference between the value of a grocer's shop for a grocer's business and its value for any other business.

I maintain that the market value of a licence is fairly represented by the Schedule A valuation, or would be so represented if the premises were properly assessed. The noble Viscount was quite correct in saying that the Schedule A valuation corresponded to the rack-rent of the premises, but that rack-rent represents what a man is prepared to pay for such premises with the special advantages which he gets from the fact that a licence is attached to them; and, therefore, that is a fair basis to take when you are estimating the loss in the value of those premises when the licence is taken away. What I think the noble Viscount forgot is that the rateable value of the premises is the basis taken for assessing the payments into the compensation fund, and as the law works at the present moment an unfair distinction is drawn between the publican of a free house and the publican of a tied house for this reason—that in both cases the rateable value of the premises is taken as the basis for their contributions to the compensation fund, but a different basis is taken when compensation is to be paid. The brewer is able to reduce his assessment by charging less to his tenant in the form of rent and more in the shape of the price of his liquor, and, therefore, he pays less into the compensation fund than a free tenant does; but when his turn comes to take out of the compensation fund he claims compensation not only for the reduced value of his premises but also for the loss of his wholesale profits. Therefore he contributes less than the free publican and obtains more. These wholesale profits are the only item which is not included in the Schedule A valuation, and I maintain that they ought not to be taken into account when we are considering what compensation ought to be given, because in a great many cases the wholesale profits are not lost at all when a licence is taken away. I had a good example of this brought before me this year when the licence of a tied house was going to be taken away under the Act of 1904, and in Court the representative of the brewing firm who owned the house said to one of our trust company representatives: "I am obliged to oppose the taking away of this licence, but, as a matter of fact, it is not going to do us any damage, because I shall receive £2,000 compensation for that licence, and I shall not lose the sale of a barrel of beer by the loss of it." In that £2,000 was calculated a certain proportion of the wholesale profits of the brewer, whose representative admitted that he was not going to lose a barrel of beer by the transaction. We have heard a good deal about robbery under this Bill. I do not like such rhetorical phrases, and I am not going to call this robbery of the State, but in operations of this kind which are going on under the law to-day all over the country there is something going on which is very much like taking money under false pretences from the State. For these reasons, My Lords, I hold that the basis of compensation under this Bill is a just and equitable one, and it is the same basis as that which is chosen for contributions to the compensation fund.

But when I come to the number of years purchase of the Schedule A valuation, I confess this strikes me as entirely inadequate. When you think of the source of this compensation fund, when you remember that it is paid out of the pockets of the trade; that it is, as has been admitted on both sides of the House, a compulsory insurance fund; it strikes me as somewhat shabby—I can use no other word—to exact as high and it may be higher premiums than heretofore, and then when the licence is taken away to give compensation which is totally inadequate for the loss. I am speaking now of the number of years purchase of the annual licence value given by the Bill. I have gone into these figures very carefully, and I have considered them in relation to the houses of which I have some knowledge under various trust companies, and I find that before the Kennedy judgment was delivered the number of years purchase of the licensed value of a house given by the Inland Revenue authorities under the Act of 1904 was something between twenty and twenty-four years purchase. After careful consideration of actual figures I say that nothing short of twenty-one years purchase of the Schedule A value of a licence would give adequate compensation to a licence-holder, and if we had gone into Committee I should have been prepared to bring forward an Amendment to raise the compensation payments to this amount. This is a matter of detail which could have been settled in Committee, and I very much regret that no opportunity is to be given to us for discussing a matter of this sort, which, although it is a detail, is very important, and I maintain that it would have been perfectly competent for your Lordships if we had read this Bill a second time to have dealt in any way you thought fit with the question of compensation. I confess that I am very much disappointed that no such opportunity is to be afforded.

There is one other part of this Bill which raises the question of justice or equity, and it is that part which establishes a time-limit to existing licences. The Bill as it stands proposes that the compensation levy and the compensation payments should run over a period of fourteen years; that at the end of that time they should cease; that the licences which survive should be renewed for a further period of seven years, and that at the end of that period, twenty-one years in all, all claims to their renewal should cease and the State should have absolute discretion as to their disposal. I admit that this additional seven years, in the form in which it appears in the Bill at the present moment, is but a poor concession. It does not contain that element which is absolutely essential to a time-limit if it is to be consistent with justice, viz., fixity of tenure. But this again was a matter which was entirely within your Lordships' discretion. This seven years tenure as at this moment proposed is limited by two facts—the discretion of the justices during those seven years and the operation of local veto machinery. But it would have been perfectly competent for your Lordships, if we had gone into Committee, to sweep away both those limitations. There was nothing whatever to prevent it, and if you had done that you would have got a time-limit which, in principle at any rate, would have corresponded with that which Mr. Balfour himself and speakers on the front Opposition bench have declared to be just and equitable. There might still have been a question as to whether the number of years was long enough or not, but the number of years of the time-limit is only a detail which, I cannot help thinking, is capable of adjustment if we could only agree upon the principle of it. That is all I want to say about the question of interests and equity. I have been obliged to deal with it on broad lines. There are many details which I should have liked to have discussed, and should have been prepared to do so if opportunity had occurred, but they are details more fitted for the Committee stage of the Bill.

Now I want to come to the other great question which is raised by this Bill, the question of temperance. This Amendment, and I think almost every speech by which it has been advocated, declares that the Bill is going to do nothing for temperance. I think that in almost every speech which I have heard in favour of the Amendment the speaker has said: "I entirely fail to see what this Bill is going to do to advance the cause of temperance." If I were anxious to score a debating point I might point out to the House that the Amendment is asking us to believe that all the temperance organisations in this country who, with singular unanimity, have accepted this Bill in principle; that the right rev. Primate and his colleagues on that bench, who have had some personal experience of temperance work; that men like my noble friend Lord Peel, who has given years of thought to this subject; that all these people know less about the question of temperance and how it will be affected by this Bill than do the noble Lords who are going to follow the noble Marquess into the lobby. It may be so, but it is making rather a large demand upon our credulity. Again, I might ask, when I remember the speech made by Lord Halsbury last night, what are we to think of the zeal in the cause of temperance of a man whose only contribution to this debate on that subject was to remind the House that over-eating was as serious as over-drinking, that beer was part of the necessary diet of the working-man, and that 6d. a day was, after all, not a very large sum for a man to spend in drink. Over-eating as serious an evil as over-drinking! My Lords, is not there something rather grim in that pleasantry when we think of the classes who will be affected by this Bill? If there is an evil connected with food in that class, I think it arises rather from under-feeding than from over-eating. But I do not want to make mere debating points against those with whom, though I disagree, I do so with great reluctance, and I am quite prepared to take up the challenge which has been thrown down, that this Bill is going to do nothing for the cause of temperance, and I am perfectly prepared to give my reasons for thinking differently.

It is assumed by those who use this argument that the Act of 1904 did all that was necessary for the cause of temperance, that it is working well and that no amendment of the law is required. Now, without denying that the Act of 1904 did certainly, in some respects, advance the cause of temperance, I just want to bring to the notice of your Lordships one or two points in which that Act had a contrary effect. The first point I want to call your attention to is one which I do not think was contemplated at the time when it was passed, viz., that it has taken away from the justices of petty sessional divisions the power of imposing conditions on the renewal of existing licences. I will give you two illustrations of the effect which the Act has had in this respect. Before the year 1905 the Liverpool justices found that they were able to do a good deal for the cause of temperance and for the public good, by imposing conditions as to the structure of licensed premises and the conditions of trade carried on in them. The neighbouring justices of Birkenhead being impressed with what had been done in Liverpool decided to take the same course, and the conditions which they sought to impose were certainly not unreasonable ones and were solely in the public interest. They included such conditions as that no intoxicating liquor should be sold on credit, that no intoxicating liquor should be supplied to any child under fourteen, that the licensee should devote his whole time to his business, and that back doors were to be kept locked. But they found that the Act of 1904 debarred them from imposing those conditions. The case was taken into Court and it was decided that since the passing of that Act the justices had no power whatever to impose those conditions.

Then there was an even stronger case, the case of the "Sun Inn" at Warsash, in which the Fareham justices discovered that a large number of Sunday trippers were being served with drink on Sunday in certain houses during the hours of closing, although they were in no sense *bona fide* travellers. They therefore summoned the licensees before them and explained that they did not wish this class of person to be served. The licensees, having heard what the magistrates had to say, agreed to the conditions imposed and said they would see that they were carried out. On the next Sunday after this decision of the bench was given, the tenants of the four houses concerned endeavoured to carry out their instructions, but the owner of the houses, the representative of the brewing firm, came down and ordered his publicans to serve these people as they had been doing hitherto and the publicans did as they were told. The magistrates applied to the Home Office for authority to enforce their decision, and were told that they had no power to do anything at all. Those are illustrations of the way in which this Act, though quite unintentionally, has had a real detrimental effect, and the remedy is to be found in Clause 22 of this Bill.

There is one other way in which this Act is working contrary to the interests of temperance. The authors of the Act of 1904 will remember, I think, that Clause

4 of that Act was intended to prevent in future the growth of that monopoly which Lord Salisbury described as an outrage and which Lord Lansdowne called an unhealthy excrescence. It was intended that, at any rate, with regard to new licences, the State should be free to deal with them as it pleased. But the practice has grown up for justices under the Act of 1904 to grant licences, annually renewable licences, and at the same time to charge in some cases an enormous capital sum in respect of the monopoly value of the premises. I was looking through the Blue-book which is published each year of licensing statistics and I found that as much as £20,000 had been asked and paid for an annually renewable licence. This practice is one which is detrimental to the cause of temperance, because it imposes a financial burden upon a man who is just setting up a new business and compels him to recoup himself out of his trade to the extent of this capital charge before he can put any profit whatever in his pocket. It is detrimental to the cause of temperance, it is contrary to the public interest and opposed to the whole spirit of the Act of 1904, because it creates again, and in an aggravated form, that very claim to the perpetual renewal of a licence which Section 4 of that Act was intended to remedy. Here, again, the remedy is found in Clause 26 of this Bill which provides that in the case of an annual licence the monopoly charge is not in any instance to exceed the annual value of that licence.

In fact, every single clause in Part 3 of this Bill is of value, and would bring great benefit to the cause of temperance. I shall be answered, I know, that that part of the Bill is in the main non-controversial, and I welcome the suggestion that was made by Lord St. Aldwyn that this part of the Bill, at any rate, should be saved. What I want to insist upon is this, that just as no one would be justified in defending the Bill as an equitable measure without referring to Part 1 and 2, so also no one is justified in denouncing the Bill on the ground that it does nothing for temperance without saying something about Part 3, which contains all the valuable provisions to which I have referred. But I do not wish it to be thought that the value of this Bill from a temperance point of view is confined to Part 3. I come to what is admittedly the core and kernel of the Bill, viz., the clauses which deal with the reduction period and the time-limit, and here I want to say something about the value of reduction generally as a temperance measure. I attach the greatest possible importance to a policy of reducing the number of public-houses, but not upon the usual ground on which such a policy is advocated and on which it was advocated by the right rev. Primate in his speech last night, viz., the ground that every public-house is a temptation, that as you multiply temptations you multiply the chances and probabilities of excessive drinking, and that in proportion as you diminish temptations you promote the cause of temperance. I think the extent to which that is true is a debateable matter, and I, myself, do not attach very great value to a policy of reduction on that ground; but there is another aspect of the question which I feel is of the utmost importance, and it has been very forcibly brought to my notice in connection with the work of which I have had experience. The more I study this question the more convinced I am that the evils of intemperance, the bad habits and demoralisation which are attendant upon the sale of drink in public-houses, can be to a large extent either increased or diminished by the character of the house in which the liquor is sold, and I believe that view is shared very largely by noble Lords on this side of the House, if I may judge by the reception given a few days ago to Lord Lamington's Bill, and also by the speech of the noble Marquess in moving his Amendment. I believe there is a strong desire on this side of the House to improve the public-house; but what I want to point out is this, that the number of public-houses has a very great influence indeed upon their character, and that the multiplication of public-houses has, in the main, a demoralising effect upon the character of the houses. If you have only one public-house in any district you can trust to the good sense of those who use it to see that its reputation is kept up, that its high character is preserved, and that a high standard of public opinion prevails within its walls. But as you multiply rivals to that public-house so you diminish its power of doing good, and you increase its power to do harm, and when you get a state of affairs in which public-houses jostle one another together in the same street, as we have got not only in all our towns, but in many country districts throughout the land, then there is a certainty that a great many of those houses are doing incalculable mischief.

I have had instances of this brought very forcibly to my notice in my own neighbourhood. There is a village quite close to my own home a small country village in which there are no less than thirteen public-houses. Thay stand side by side, and in one case three abreast in the same street. The result of this excessive competition is that the publicans finding it extremely difficult to make a livelihood at all under such circumstances, have been forced, for the purposes of creating and retaining a trade, to compete with one another in offering very large rates of interest upon the savings of working men deposited with them as a sort of savings bank. In the town of Hitchin there is a house belonging to the trust company of which I am chairman. It is situated in a back street, and from its door you can count six or eight other public-houses. How can it be supposed that it is of any use to spend time and effort and money upon raising the character of this one particular house, in trying to make it a good, respectable place which will meet the needs of the respectable element of the population, when all those who, if you succeed, will be shamed out of your house, have only to turn next door and go into one of the other houses which are crowded together in the same street? It is from this point of view that I consider the question of reduction to be of the utmost possible importance.

Over and over again I have seen the evils of this excessive competition, and I am not the least impressed by Home Office Memoranda or statistics which are brought forward to explain the great sobriety of districts which are well served with public-houses. From the point of view of reduction this Bill is undoubtedly a great advance upon the existing law. It will accelerate the process, and that alone is a great gain to the cause of temperance. Moreover, the element of compulsion which is set up by this Bill will greatly strengthen the hands of the magistrates in fulfilling their duties. However much a local bench may be impressed with the value of a policy of reduction as a general principle they are faced with innumerable difficulties, technicalities and obstacles of one kind and another, when they come to consider which particular house they are to deal with. There is always some good reason why that particular house should be left, either it is structurally the best although badly managed, or else its management is excellent though it is an unsatisfactory building. It is not surprising that magistrates in a great many instances, resolve in despair to leave things as they are. The Bill will strengthen their hands in this particular matter by the element of compulsion which is provided, and it will give some assurance to those who believe in the value of this policy that, within a limited number of years, we shall have the public-houses of this country reduced to such a number as can effectively be controlled.

I come to the last principle in the Bill which is of the utmost value, and it is that, apart altogether from the question of redundant houses, it is desirable that the State should have the power—whether it exercised it or not will depend on the public opinion at any moment—to change, if it thinks fit, its whole policy in respect of licences. And since such a change of policy might entail either the extinction of licences in a particular neighbourhood or their transference from one set of holders to another, it is necessary that the State should give due notice of its intentions. That is the principle of what we call the time-limit, and Lord Rosebery was perfectly right when he said that that was the real question on which we were going to divide. This question of a time-limit, not the particular form it takes, not the number of years, but the fact of a time-limit at all, is the real root and essence of the whole matter. Those who vote for this Bill are going to vote for machinery which will enable the present system, some day or another, under some condition or another, to be brought to an end. Those who are going to vote for the Amendment are going to vote for keeping the present system perpetually in existence. ["No."] Noble Lords may say "No," but I would like to point out that it is perfectly impossible, under existing circumstances, unless machinery be brought in to enable the present licensing system to be brought to an end, that any temperance experiment on a large scale can be tried at all.

*EARL CROMER: Why "perpetually?"

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: Because no machinery exists.

*EARL CROMER: They can bring in another Bill.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: Certainly there may be another Bill, and I hope if this Bill is rejected that there will be another Bill; but what I want to point out is that without some time-limit machinery—I do not care in what Bill it is introduced—it is impossible for the present system to be brought to an end. Let me give you an example. I and my right rev. friend the Bishop of Chester are interested in the public-house trust experiment. Other temperance reformers have other experiments which they would like to see introduced, but I perfer to deal with the one in which I am interested myself. Supposing that he and I and others who are interested in that experiment were successful in proving to a particular local authority the desirability of substituting our plan for the plan which is in force to-day; supposing that we convinced them that the trust public-house is better than the tied house: however impressed the local authority might be with our arguments and with the desirability of the change which we advocated, it would be utterly impossible for them to do anything to help us. The ground is occupied; the tied house is already in possession, and unless we contemplate the possibility at some time or another of getting rid of the tied-house system it is idle to talk about temperance reform at all. We are bound hand and foot in a way in which no other country is bound in this matter. There are private interests in the field, private interests so strong, so entrenched, that it is impossible to make room for any alternative system. We have got to get rid of these private interests, but we have got to get rid of them, I frankly admit, on equitable and fair terms. I think noble Lords will understand that on the question of compensation or of notice to be given, I, like the Bishop of London, have always insisted that I would consider any question of detail in that machinery. I do not care how many years we have to wait; I do not care what sum we have got to pay in compensation. What I do ask is that, whatever the price we have to pay, whatever the number of years we have to wait, let us, some day or another, bring to an end a system which is universally condemned as it is universally practised.

That is all I have to say on the Bill. I feel most deeply disappointed that we are not to have any opportunity of coming to close quarters with its details. If I thought that, even at this eleventh hour words of mine could have any effect on the situation, that it would be possible by compromise or negotiation for something out of this Bill to be saved, I would plead with the House as earnestly and with all the force that I could command that such compromise or negotiation should take place. But I feel it is too late for any words of mine to have such an effect. We are going to take leave of this Bill to-night. I do not agree with the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London that never again will this subject be taken up. I agree rather with the noble Lord on the cross benches that we are at the beginning of a long series of Bills and negotiations on the subject. I have stated the reasons which prevent me from following the noble Marquess into the lobby, and I can only conclude by asking him to believe that my course of action is not dictated by any feeling of disloyalty to him or by any distrust of the motives which have led him to take the course which he has recommended to the House. I know the noble Marquess is perfectly sincere in the views which he holds and has recommended to the House, and if I cannot follow him, it is only because I differ from him conscientiously, but fundamentally, as to the effect the Bill is likely to have upon a cause to which I am deeply attached, and which I believe to be inseparably bound up with the welfare of this country.

LORD HARRIS: My Lords, starting from precisely the same standpoint, the desire to see temperance extended, as the noble Earl who has just sat down, I should come to a diametrically opposite conclusion as to the effect of this Bill. I am even less concerned with the trade than he is. I have absolutely no interest in it whatever; I have never been concerned either myself or as a trustee with any interest in any public-houses or any brewery. I start from an absolutely impartial standpoint, and I have come to the conclusion diametrically opposite to the noble Earl who has just sat down. I do not think this Bill will secure those advantages which he thinks it is certain to secure. I am going to confine my remarks to two practical points, those of the monopoly value and of the tied-house system, because I cannot help thinking that many most worthy people, people for whom one must have the highest possible respect because they are actuated by the highest motives, are under a delusion in regard to the great advantages that they think the State is going to secure under this Bill as regards these two points. The noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, last night said that this Bill was so voluminous, it raised so many principles, that he doubted whether many members of the Government on the front bench understood the whole of it. If that is true of members of the Government, is it not highly probable that there are a considerable proportion of those outside who call so loudly for the Bill who are quite as ignorant? What I venture to say is that upon those two points the advantages anticipated from this Bill will not be secured.

Let me ask you to cast your minds forward to the end of the seven years after the reduction period when the State has got to decide how these houses are to be managed—the 60,000 left. I challenge entirely the allegation that the State has parted with something extremely valuable. The State has always had within its power the right of taxing a house up to its full value. It has not done so, for very good reasons I have no doubt. What it has parted with is the reasonable expectation of continuity. That is all it has given away, and that is what has induced such an offer as the £18,000 to which the noble Earl on the cross benches referred last night. It was the expectation of continuity that has induced people to give these large sums for licences. But this Bill lays down that the licence is to be for only one year, and who is going to give a large sum for monopoly value for a year? The State is not going to make a great gain by a system of that kind, and I am very much afraid that the public, the population, are not going to gain very much as regards the character of the men who are going into the houses. What is going to be the temptation to a respectable man to go into this class of business when he has only a reasonable expectation of being left in the house for one year? And local option may do away with his home within the twelve months for which he has got the licence. What tempted respectable men to go into this business before, and what tempted people to give high prices for the licences, was the reasonable expectation that besides the business they had got a home in which they and their families were safe for a certain number of years. You are taking that away. By this Bill a man may be turned out of his home within a year.

As regards the tied-house system the noble Earl below me believes that that system will be done away with by this Bill. I am pretty sure that it will not. Who is going to pay for these not very valuable rights in the future—rights that may be taken away at any moment? I should think it is extremely probable that whoever gets the licence will be either a brewer himself or under an arrangement with a brewer for selling that particular brewer's beer. I do not see anything whatever in the Act which is likely to prevent the tied-house system going on, and in urban areas I confess I do not see very much harm about that system. My experience, both from administering Licensing Acts and from what I hear, is that the public is a very good judge of what is good beer and they go to the house which sells good beer, and if a publican is selling bad beer his house falls off in trade. My opinion is that at the end of twenty-one years under this Act the more powerful brewers will make arrangements amongst themselves what they shall hold and will arrange with the licensee of each house that he shall take their liquor. I am very much afraid the effect will be trusts such as our cousins in America are now trying to extirpate—a concentration of capital, a concentration of power in the hands of certain brewers. If that is the result the power of the trade will certainly not be diminished.

I have had to administer the Act of 1904, and I do not know that I have come to quite the same conclusion as the noble Earl below me as to what it is that makes a public-house successful. I have had cases before me which have led to the conclusion that it has more to do with the popularity of the owner than with the comfort of the house. I have had cases of houses which have been condemned by the licensing committees because they were inadequate for the proper comfort of the public, but the business done by those houses has far surpassed that of many superior houses in the neighbourhood, and I attribute it, and it is attributed by those who have had long experience, simply to the popularity of the man. I cannot quite follow my noble friend's exposition of the method of calculating the compensation under the present system. He submitted that it was upon the value of the house and not as a part of the business. The valuation at present is based upon barrelling. That is part of the business, and it is upon the business done that the value of the house is now estimated.

Apart from holding the objection already raised as to the injustice of the resumption clause, I do not believe that this Act at the end of the twenty-one years is going to produce the practical result which many who sympathise with it believe. If temperance is really the object of the party opposite—I do not question that it is—I venture to suggest to them that there are other ways of securing more rapid reduction of the opportunities for excessive drinking. By the passage of this Bill such reduction would be remarkably slow. In my own experience as chairman of Quarter Sessions, I have come to the conclusion that the business of houses in places where houses have already been delicensed undoubtedly goes up, that the houses that remain are doing a bigger business because some of the customers of the old houses are coming to them. The customers of the extinguished houses go to the other houses.

Both the right rev. Primate and the right rev. the Bishop of Hereford expressed a wish that some counteracting inducements could be put in the way of people other than the public-house. I think it was the Bishop of Birmingham who said he had often seen abroad whole families enjoying beer, or coffee, or lemonade, and he said he asked himself why we cannot have that sort of thing in England. There is nothing to prevent our having it in England if the State will assist in the establishment of such places. Attempts are made now to set up counter-attractions in the shape of tea-houses, but the competition is so great that it is almost too much for private finance. If you want to set up a place which will take away from the public-house a large number of those people who frequent it now, it must be with the assistance of the State, because otherwise the competition is too great. Such places would undoubtedly attract away from the public-house many people who are now compelled to go there, not because they want to drink, but because it is the only house open to the public, where a person can find shelter and warmth and food. I venture to suggest that as a far more rapid way of securing temperance than anything that would be secured by this Bill. I cordially agree with the Amendment, because I cannot help thinking that parts of this Bill are due to vindictiveness, and I am sure that some parts of it are not strictly just to those who have been induced by the action of the State to invest their money in this particular business.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: My Lords, I have been deeply interested in the speech of Lord Lytton, who has a peculiar experience of temperance reform, and has not been afraid to put his principles into practice. That speech was the first which, in my opinion, has endeavoured to show what measures of temperance there are in the Bill. But what measures has the noble Lord discovered? I do not think that throughout his speech Lord Lytton singled out for commendation a single temperance measure of the Bill which could be described as one of its main features. He singled out for commendation provisions in Part 3, and he expressed a desire for certain Amendments of the Act of 1904 and of the state of the law as regards the Kennedy judgment, whilst he insisted upon the right of the State to change its system if it thought fit. None of these are the main principles of the present Bill. The main principles of the Bill are not concerned with Part 3, nor with Amendments of the 1904 Act, nor indeed, can we say with truth that the reduction of licences is in itself the main feature. The reduction of licences by statute is a principle which was established in the Act of 1904. The main features of this Bill are the means by which these results are sought to be attained, and against those methods the noble Earl, so far as I understood him, was as loud in protest as any Member of your Lordships' House.

What has been the conduct of His Majesty's Government as regards the Bill in this House, and how have they explained its temperance provisions or endeavoured to meet the wishes and aspirations of genuine temperance reformers in this matter? We have heard many able speeches upon the Bill, but none more able than that of the noble Lord, Viscount St. Aldwyn, who expressed warm approbation, for instance, of Part 3 of the measure. The House has heard many speeches from the right rev. bench and others expressing strong approbation of many parts of the Bill, whilst finding considerable fault with various radical principles in it. The House has heard expressions from many quarters of a real and genuine desire for temperance reform, a desire which this House has also shown by its past history. By the Bill which it passed in 1902, by the measure which it sanctioned in 1904, it has shown no mere lip-service to temperance reform, but a genuine desire to pass any well-considered and just measure.

But when the Government are asked to give some sort of indication in what way they would meet temperance reformers if they desired to make some Amendments to this Bill, they show that their zeal for temperance is not so great as their zeal for the confiscatory principles of this Bill. They have given no indication as to how they would be ready to meet the genuine desires of those who are strongly in favour of temperance reform and yet are opposed to some of the main confiscatory principles of the Bill. Does not the silence or immobility of the front bench justify the views of those who did not anticipate that the Government would in any way meet the legitimate desires to amend the Bill, and does it not indicate that those who proceeded to move Amendments in Committee would have met with no sympathy or consideration from the Government? The Earl of Lytton was desirous of giving the Bill a Second Reading, because he saw in it some principles making for real temperance reform. I do not share the noble Lord's views that the House could deal with the Bill in any way it thought fit in Committee. There is hardly an Amendment that I would wish to move to the Bill—and there are many such Amendments—which would not at once be met by the question of the financial relations between the two Houses. In view of past experience what reason have we for believing we should receive consideration in the matter? For the reason, if for no other, that we are unable to deal with the Bill as we think fit in Committee, I, for one, am obliged to vote against the Second Reading.

I regard the main principles of this Bill as more than Committee points. There is the proposition to impose a time-limit running concurrently with a levy upon the trade. The noble Earl talked of being ready to pay as much compensation as you like in order to change the conditions of this trade. But the compensation comes out of the pockets of the trade itself, and I venture to think his generosity was somewhat misplaced. The proposition as it stands can only be described as an insurance by certain members of the trade against the abolition of the houses. What the Bill really proposes is a raid upon the insurance fund established under the guarantee of Parliament in 1904, and a raid made at a time when the matter is further complicated by the chance of the loss of a licence through local option, and when the conditions of compensation are grievously spoilt by the new system of lumping together all compensation moneys, and by the feature which now appears in all Government Bills—that of a Department in Whitehall assuming control. Another feature which I cannot regard as a Committee point is the proposed change of the basis of compensation. It is a point which would be difficult to amend without coming into conflict with financial questions. It is not a Committee point, because it is one of the first principles in the Bill.

I would ask your Lordships to consider the way in which the Government met this point when it was put. It has been pointed out to them in debate and on other occasions that this new compensation scale would work intolerable hardship in a number of cases. How was that met? There was no attempt to prove that in those particular cases hardship would not arise, but it was said, "Yes; it is true the compensation will not be equal to the expenditure, but you must remember that the property was purchased at a time when it was well known there would be licensing proposals by the Government and when the speeches of Sir Thomas Whittaker and others were being heard all over the country, and people were very great fools to give so large a price when they knew the Liberal Government were to come into power." On that basis it would be possible for the State in future to take away any property at an unfair valuation. The House is familiar with the speeches by Mr. Snowden, and other Gentlemen who agree with him. There are Members of this House who have invested money in land and other forms of property. If at some future time there should exist a desire to deal with property other than licences on a similar basis to that proposed in this Bill, then we should be told that we were great fools to have paid the price for what we have purchased when, according to the speeches of Mr. Snowden and others, our property was to have no value at all in the future.

That is what the Government are doing in this Bill. Their scale of compensation works intolerable hardships upon certain people who bought their property in the open market in many cases not many years ago, and who will receive a bare pittance as compensation. They are told that they ought not to have bought it at such prices because Gentlemen were making speeches at the time which showed they could not expect to get those prices owing to future Government legislation. Principles of that kind in the Bill make it impossible for me to vote for the Second Reading. We have had no answer from the Government as to their willingness to see passed into law those parts of the Bill which can be described as non-contentious, and which certainly would command the adherence of all real temperance reformers. In default of any indication on the part of the Government to deal with those parts of the Bill, I, for one, am forced to vote against those first principles to which they obstinately adhere and which I conceive to do so great wrong to the individual. I, for one, would sooner this matter ended upon Second Reading; and I would rather see this question decided by your Lordships taking a stand in favour of the rights of the individual than by their having in the future to take a stand upon the rights of this House to introduce financial Amendments.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, I have more than once during the debate been inclined to think that the proper preface to it would have been that we should have asked the Clerk at the Table to read the Burial Service. The two principal speeches in opposition to the Bill might have been followed up by the familiar line, "I come to bury Cæsar, not to praise him." We on this side of the House feel that our task—always difficult on such occasions as this—is one of peculiar difficulty, for we are arguing on an issue decided some days ago outside this House. At least we shall agree that you are giving to the

Bill a first class funeral. You have assembled, I will not say a great number of mourners, but a large crowd, to attend the funeral. A great number of noble Lords have arrived who have not often honoured us with their presence. I can only hope that they have been carefully shepherded, and that none of them lost their way or will lose their way. That is not altogether an idle fear. I am an old Member of the House of Commons, and I remember an incident which I did not actually see, but which I heard of, and which, I think, some of your Lordships heard of. In 1869, when the Irish Church Disestablishment Bill came up before your Lordships' House, there was an occasion very like this when an enormous number of Peers were sent for by the late Lord Derby, to come and bury the Bill of Mr. Gladstone in this House. Lord Derby up to that time, or very nearly so, had had the power of carrying the Peers in his pocket, if I may say so, because he had had their proxies. But proxies had been abolished two years before and the result was that the Peers had to come personally if they intended to record their votes. One July afternoon a venerable person, slightly agricultural rather than political in appearance was observed sitting on the front bench below the gangway amongst the Members of the House of Commons. There had recently been a bye-election, and the Members of the House of Commons not unnaturally thought that this was the new Radical Member, but after a few moments the gentleman turned round to his neighbour and said: "Is this the House of Lords?" They said: "No, this is the House of Commons." It appeared he was a man, no doubt of fame and distinction in his own county, but who, up to that time, had always given his proxy to Lord Derby, and when he got into the central lobby, took the turning to the left instead of the turning to the right. Although he was a person of very Conservative opinions he was taken to be the new Radical Member and sat down below the gangway, whence, he was ejected, and made, not with shame to take a lower room, but with all dignity to take a seat in the Upper House.

I cannot help thinking on this occasion that we have a great number of noble Lords here who may have been seen walking about in the streets of the City, but have not very frequently attended your Lordships' debates, and we are going to be "snowed under," if I may use that expression, by this tremendous invasion. Against that we feel that argument struggles in vain. But this is not one of the occasions, such as have happened no doubt frequently in this House, where we feel, not only that our numbers are few, but that we have had to acknowledge the great force and powers of that formidable front bench opposite upon which are ranged so many men of great eminence and experience in politics and in law, and who generally receive the support of the whole of their party and also, as a rule, that of the right rev. Prelates. I ask any impartial man who has sat in this debate, and has listened from first to last, where the weight of argument has been on this occasion, and where the views, the intelligent views, of the country have been? We have heard speech after speech from both sides of the House—one just now of notable ability from the noble Lord below the gangway—Lord Lytton. We have heard speech after speech from Peers who differ from us as a rule, from right rev. Prelates who are nearly always found in the opposite lobby to us, and they have said with striking unanimity and convincing argument that they consider a Second Reading ought to be given to this Bill. The debate has ranged over an enormous field. It was stated in the House of Commons by the late Prime Minister that one round in his indictment against this Bill was that it was not one Bill, but six Bills. My Lords, we defend it because it is six Bills, and not one Bill. We defend it because it is a great measure of temperance reform which attacks the problem not at one corner, but along the whole line, and if I may say so, upon every head. And therefore, if anybody, even the late Prime Minister, likes to try to injure it by saying that this is a Bill of six articles, all I can say is I do not object to that description.

But the main point which we have to consider on the Second Reading debate is whether there is, even under the six heads of the Bill, one great underlying principle upon which we can ask your Lordships to give the Bill a Second Reading. The answer to that was given in a speech yesterday, which I am sure will be widely read in the country, because all his speeches are, and will produce an even greater effect than is usual, great as that effect always is. I mean the speech of my noble friend Lord Rosebery when he pointed out that there was in this Bill the great underlying principle of the time-limit, and that it was according as you approved or disapproved of having a time-limit that you ought to record your vote, for or against this Bill. That is the argument which I venture again this evening to submit to your Lordships. Though I am told there is no hope of compromise, and that no negotiations are going on, until the noble Lord on the Woolsack is handed the figures I shall not believe that this House has rejected a great measure of temperance reform.

We have had the usual arguments, and we have heard the usual cry about oppression and injustice and hardship. I hope I shall never be found on any occasion deaf to the appeals of those who consider they are being treated with hardship or injustice in pecuniary matters, but I have always felt that in regard to this question there is no class that comes before Parliament which has so bad a *prima facie* case, when it raises the cry about financial oppression and injustice, as that which is interested in the sale of alcoholic liquors. We know that during the last year or two there has been a marked fall in the value of brewery shares; we know that for many years before there was a period of great and abounding prosperity, that enormous fortunes were made, and that the wealth of the great brewing industry of this country is second only to that great development of wealth which has been the result of the discovery of gold in South Africa. It is a common joke in London to say that the frontage of Park Lane, which is considered a sort of final test of respectability, is divided between wealthy brewers and South African millionaires. South African millionaires have never asked for compensation. Why during the last twenty years has not this great and wealthy interest insured itself against financial danger, seeing that since the case of *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield* at any rate, full notice has been received by the brewing and public-house industry of this country that there was great danger looming in the distance and gradually approaching nearer. As a matter of fact it would be untrue to say that the idea of insurance never did occur to them, because it is perfectly well-known that a few years ago a company was actually started and a circular issued with a view of forming an insurance business against the possible loss of licences under a change of circumstances, including a change of law. But as a matter of fact, the liquor interest, the brewing interest of this country, preferred the chance of being well entrenched in Parliament and making themselves, as Lord Rosebery said, as powerful, if not more powerful, than the law, rather than to resort, as they ought to have done years ago, to those ordinary methods of finance which every man of business resorts to if he has a property of possibly deteriorating character.

Do we fully realise the enormous power and privileges of this interest? I am not attacking them for having this property; they are just as well entitled to their great property as anybody else is to his small property. But why did they not years ago insure themselves against risk and against loss? They are specially favoured in many respects by the law. The licence duties in this country are extremely low. It is a commonplace that probably a large revenue could be extracted in aid of our taxes by a rise of the licence duties. The late Mr. Childers told me that he believed Mr. Gladstone, if he had succeeded in abolishing the income-tax in 1874, had intended to get the revenue he would have lost in that way. It is not only in regard to licence duties that the trade is in an extraordinarily favoured position. It has been acknowledged in these debates in both Houses of Parliament that in regard to rating, owing to the intricacies of our law of rating and to the enormous power which the liquor interest has owing to its wealth to carry every case to a Court of Appeal, they enjoy extraordinary privileges and are in an extraordinary position. I think one of the clauses in this Bill which I specially recommend to the favourable attention of your Lordships is that which will do a great deal to induce the owners of licensed property themselves to be willing to go more thoroughly into the question of valuation, and to see if their property is properly assessed, because although they may lose in one way they will gain in another way, for the valuation comes in on the question of compensation.

It is true that these favours exist, but why? Because, I believe, it was recognised that although this was a great and powerful interest yet it was essentially a precarious one, because it rested upon an annual licence duty. You cannot have it both ways; you cannot claim that the licence which is only an annual interest shall be raised into something far higher, and shall receive protection from the law for a considerable period, or shall be treated as property in the full sense of the term, and that at the same time all these privileges which have gradually accumulated around the licensed interest because it is a precarious interest shall be continued. For that reason this Bill proposes to place the whole of these matters upon a business footing. It recognises the position of the licence-holder, not, indeed, as the owner of a freehold estate or property, but it recognises that he has an interest. It secures that interest for a certain number of years, it hedges it about with a contribution to a compensation fund, and at the same time holds out inducements, which, no doubt, a Valuation Bill will secure more fully in a short time, to holders of that class of property to get their property at its proper value on to the rate-book.

The whole, no doubt, of these arrangements will be placed under the control of the Commission. I have heard the cry raised, and it was echoed yesterday by the noble Earl, Lord Halsbury, that this Commission is, and will be, a great engine of power and oppression. We have heard about the slight placed upon local authorities, and how there would be three Commissioners sitting in London disposing of the rights and property and liberties of the people of this land in regard to liquor, and we were told that the drinking of beer was part of the common law of England. That is a great addition to the law which was made by the noble Earl, Lord Halsbury, and I have no doubt will be chronicled with his judgments. But this cry about Commissions is an old cry. We have heard it before. Anybody who knows anything of the political history of this country remembers the cry that was raised against the India Bill of Mr. Fox. Why was that cry raised? Why was it that Bill was side-tracked in your Lordships' House? It was very largely because of the cry raised against the Commissioners. It was said the whole of the property and liberties and rights of the people of India, and everybody in England who was interested in India, would be placed at the disposal of three Commissioners, appointed by a Liberal Government, and so great was the indignation raised against that proposal that the Bill, as we all know, was got rid of in your Lordships' House, and one of the greatest political changes took place that this country has ever known, because it altered the course of events in this country for fifty years.

What happened in that case? A short time after the Commission had been got rid of, the Board of Control was invented, but wicked people who examined the powers and duties of that Board, which nobody in particular objected to, very soon saw that it was in reality only the old Commission dressed up again, and that the powers did not differ in any material particular. The old cry had done its duty and was forgotten. The same cry was raised in your Lordships' House against the Poor Law Commission. That Commission was one of the most powerful bodies ever invented by law, and when the measure setting it up came to your Lordships' House after a great and prolonged struggle in the House of Commons, attempts were made to get rid of it here by precisely the same arguments as those which fell from Lord Halsbury, and I believe it is the undoubted fact that if the Liberal Government of the time had not received the support of the great Duke of Wellington, that Commission would probably never have struggled into being. Therefore, I brush aside as entirely irrelevant all this alarm which is attempted to be raised in regard to the Commission

We are also told—and this is, I think, the most extraordinary thing that has been said in this debate—that we have not got the full weight of evidence in support of our proposal for the limitation of licences. Why, my Lords, that was the one thing on which the Majority and Minority Reports of Lord Peel's Commission agreed. The Commission disagreed upon a great number of things, but they were practically unanimous on this, that the increase of temptation to drink was the cause of increased drunkenness. Those interested in social questions, in whatever capacity, have long since come to that conclusion, and Judges and chairmen of Quarter Sessions have over and over again, in charges to Grand Juries, expressed the same opinion. When, as a young man, I was one of the managers of an industrial school in London, with which I am still connected, I remember noticing the haggard appearance of some children who had recently been admitted, and the doctor said to me: "What can you expect of children brought up upon a *regime* of gin and sprats?" I have never forgotten the expression. They were children of the very poorest class, who had spent the whole of their lives in quarters of London amongst a class of whose existence I daresay some persons are hardly aware. I know myself that though I did believe at one time that I had seen some of the slums in London, I never realised the terrible effect of drink among the poorest classes of London until I was taken through some of the East End slums by a Cambridge friend who had taken up a curacy in that part. It is those places that you must visit if you want to see the effect of the drink traffic in full horror. Right rev. Prelates have worked among the crowded populations of our great towns and know that the e is the heart of the evil; but from some of the speeches made during the debate it is evident that among many leading men there is, not perhaps unnaturally, a great want of appreciation of what the drink traffic and the drink problem really is.

I listened with great interest to what fell from noble Lords opposite in regard to the question of vested interests. We were reminded of the extreme care with which Parliament had treated those officers of the Army who were deprived of advantages by the passing of Lord Cardwell's Act, advantages they had purchased and for which they had paid lawful prices and also further prices not recognised under the law. It is perfectly true—nobody has disputed it—that they were compensated, but there was a great deal of controversy over the surplus price, and I do not feel at all certain in more recent circumstances that Parliament would allow itself to be so easily persuaded to make the payments that were then sanctioned. I remember a speech by Sir George Grey in opposition to the payment. Sir George Grey had as unrivalled an authority on home affairs as his successor Sir Edward Grey now has on foreign affairs; and it is well known that he did the whole of the home work in Lord Palmerston's Cabinet. Sir George Grey made a speech against giving the surplus price to those officers. We have been reminded also of Mr. Gladstone's action in regard to the Ulster custom of tenant right. I venture to say that in recognising the interest of licence-holders the Government are following those precedents, and upon those precedents we defend ourselves against the demand of extreme critics on our own side — that licence-holders should be treated as having a merely annual, or ephemeral, interest.

I at one moment thought of addressing myself to the very able arguments, if I may be allowed to say so, that were addressed to the House by the noble Viscount, Lord St. Aldwyn, in regard to the compensation clauses in the Bill. By the compensation clauses I mean, not merely the actual sum which any individual licence-holder may receive, but the whole of that subject which falls under the head of the basis of compensation, the distribution of compensation, the period of time—which, as Lord Rosebery pointed out, is really the root of the matter—and the question as to what is to happen with monopoly value both during the compensation period and after. But the clear and lucid statement which your Lordships have heard this afternoon from the noble Earl, Lord

Lytton, has made this to a great extent unnecessary, and I certainly shall not attempt to take up your time or spoil the noble Earl's arguments by repeating them. The noble Earl went over the ground with perfect knowledge of the facts and the law, and he has stated our case as well as we could possibly have desired it to be stated. Therefore I will not add anything to that part of the case.

But when we are told that we are introducing a new principle in regard to compensation by excluding brewers' profits, and thereby practically reversing the Kennedy judgment, I would venture to remind the noble and learned Earl, Lord Halsbury, of what was said by leading members of the late Government in discussions of the Act of 1904. The Home Secretary said—

> "Compensation was given in respect of on-licences, not on the loss of business profits but on depreciation of the premises arising from the fact that the extinction of the licence prevented the house from being used for the purpose for which it was most adapted."

The Solicitor-General said—

> "What was estimated was the depreciation of the property, and that was the whole basis and foundation of the Bill. It was said that the bulk of the compensation would go to the owners, who in many cases were brewers. He totally and absolutely denied it."

One of the greatest authorities in the House of Commons at that time on the law of licensing, Mr. (now Sir) Charles Cripps, said exactly the same thing, and he is a very independent supporter of the Government, as we all know from the events of the last few days. My blood was curdled yesterday by a placard which I saw, and by the offer to me of a newspaper which the news-vendor alleged contained the news of the resignation of the Government. I had not heard of the resignation myself and I bought a paper, to find that it was not the resignation of the Government nor of an individual member of the Government, but the resignation of the Vicar-General of the Province of Canterbury. I found that Sir Charles Cripps had resigned, not in consequence of the Licensing Bill, but in consequence of the Education Bill, thereby showing that on occasion he is quite able to assert his independence of his political friends. But with regard to this Bill, he came forward and gave the support of his known authority on licensing to the Government. I cite him now as an independent witness. How can it be said, whatever may be the rights and wrongs of the question, that we are departing from the intention of Parliament when we are proceeding on the lines of the Act of 1904?

I am willing, however, to grant that this is a topic upon which reasonable men may differ, and agree to differ; it is mixed with questions of rating and valuation, and surely the proper course is to settle such matters in Committee and not in a Second Reading debate. Let me remind your Lordships of what fell from the noble Viscount, Lord St. Aldwyn. He said he would have preferred a market value basis, and he gave four heads under which value might be computed. Among those he mentioned a sum to represent what may be called the goodwill for which, he said, the brewer was entitled to some compensation, less than the Kennedy judgment gave him, more than the Bill proposes to give him. Such points are matters of detail and proper for consideration in Committee. The noble Viscount, proceeding with his indictment, said it was a monstrous thing that at the end of the period of twenty-one years, or whatever the period may be, the publican who had paid into the compensation fund should be treated as the holder of a new on-licence and run the risk of losing his licence altogether, or, at all events, if he got it, of having to pay the monopoly value, subject again to the risks of local option and the caprice of the magistrates. But can it be worth while to throw out this Bill on Second Reading merely because you think that an injustice may be done by one of the clauses twenty-one years hence? That is contrary to the rule of common sense and to every custom of debate.

It is said that the Government will not listen to Amendments. We have never said anything of the kind. No Government in its senses, and especially a Government in a minority in your Lordships' House, would say they would not listen to Amendments. What we want to see are the Amendments placed on the Paper. We all speak with the highest respect of the noble Viscount, Lord St. Aldwyn, a man of immense experience not only in Imperial but in all local affairs concerned with rating, valuation, and assessment. There is absolutely nobody, by universal consent, in either House of Parliament more able to frame Amendments and to explain them; and I am quite certain I can say for the Government that we had hoped, from the tone of most of the speech of the noble Viscount, that he was going to support us on the Second Reading, reserving to himself full liberty to put down and press Amendments touching the points of the measure with which he did not agree. But, unfortunately, the noble Viscount took up a different position at the conclusion of his speech, and he will be found in the great and serried ranks which are about to give the Bill its death blow in the lobbies.

Even at the eleventh hour I would ask: Are we to lose this great opportunity? Do noble Lords opposite really think that this debate will not be read, marked, learnt, and inwardly digested throughout the whole country? Do they think that no effect will be produced upon the mind of the ordinary British citizen when he finds that an independent Peer who has been Prime Minister of this country, the noble Earl who sits on the cross benches; when he finds that the most rev. Primate, the natural mouthpiece of the Church of which noble Lords opposite are, I fancy, stronger supporters than many of us on this side; when he finds that a noble Lord of such great administrative experiences as Lord Balfour—when he finds that these noble Lords record their vote with us and that other independent Peers leave the House? I do not believe that the ordinary Unionist voter who recognises Mr. Balfour as his Leader has any desire to see this country governed by a revival of something very like the old Tory Party which governed, or rather misgoverned, this country for fifteen years after the Battle of Waterloo. The party opposite is rapidly shedding, one by one, all those independent elements which gave it force. Tariff reform has taken many away. The benches opposite are full of independent Peers who no longer habitually support the front bench; and it appears to me that the front bench are gradually resolving themselves into something like the old Tory Guard, and that their real Leader is the noble and learned Earl who until recently sat upon the Woolsack. Yes, my Lords, we are celebrating a funeral. The motto of this debate, as I have said, was struck in its opening speeches—

> "I come to bury Cæsar, not to praise him."

But may I remind your Lordships that in the same speech from which that familiar quotation is taken there is another line equally famous—

> "The evil which men do lives after them."

Yes:—I fear, my Lords, that when the result of these events comes to be written by the future historian the vote of to-night, killing this great measure of licensing and temperance reform, will not be accounted to your Lordships' House for righteousness.

THE EARL OF **MEATH**: My Lords, so many years of my life have been spent in combating the evils of intemperance that it is with the greatest regret that I find myself unable to give my vote in favour of this Bill. And why? Not that I am not alive, deeply alive, to all the evils, social and national, which are brought upon this country by intemperance. I am as well aware as the noble Lord who has just spoken of the terrible results of drink, but, at the same time, I cannot in my conscience say that this is a Bill which only considers the question of temperance.

There is, to my mind, no small amount of injustice in this Bill, and I for one will never allow my vote to be given for good in one direction if it brings evils in another. Already in this debate a famous saying by Archbishop Magee has been quoted. I am not going to repeat it, but will paraphrase it. If I were asked whether I would wish this country to be either sober or honest I would certainly reply, without hesitation, that I would rather see it honest. The difference between us is not, as the noble Lord has put it, that on the one side we wish to uphold and support a certain trade, and that on the other it is desired to get rid of intemperance. We both desire to get rid of intemperance; it is only a question of method. We wish that temperance should be advanced and that justice should be done, but we are not—at least

I am not—going to separate the one from the other. Is this a just and well-considered measure? If it could be proved to be such I should be the first to give it my most earnest support, but I cannot honestly say that it is. Its glaring faults have already been eloquently described, faults of omission as well as of commission. I do not profess to possess an abnormal sense of justice or of virtue, but I cannot subordinate the sense I have. I believe honestly that this is not a just and honest Bill. I give full credit to those who recognise merits in the Bill—I myself recognise many—but I deny that it covers the whole ground of temperance, and I certainly do not consider that it is a Bill which should be passed at this day. We who oppose the Bill have been asked why we do not pass the Second Reading, go into Committee, and move Amendments. That we would be willing to do if we saw the smallest chance of our Amendments being accepted. It is well known that most of those Amendments would be of a financial character, and if we had once passed the Second Reading we should be in the position of having approved the principle of the Bill, and then of having our Amendments flung in our faces because, forsooth, it would be said that they touched the privileges of the House of Commons. The choice, therefore, is a Hobson's choice. We have no chance whatever of passing Amendments. Therefore we can only reject the Bill in the hope that at some future date we shall have a Bill which will not offend our consciences.

Although I am afraid this Bill will be rejected, is it not possible for the two parties to come together, as they have on the Education Bill, and come to some compromise? There are large numbers of us who believe that there are many points in this Bill which would meet the views of all moderate men, and I hope that something of that sort will be done. I am glad to observe that Lord Monkswell has done his best to try and save some portion of the wreckage of this Bill by proposing that Clause 21, dealing with the exclusion of children from bars of licensed houses, should be incorporated in the Children Bill, which comes before your Lordships on Monday. Personally I should be very glad if some other portions of the Bill could in the same way be incorporated in another measure. In my opinion the spirit of political vindictiveness is so apparent in this Bill that your Lordships will be amply justified in throwing it out on Second Reading, even though it should come in the specious guise of a professing intention of considering the noble and great question of temperance.

EARL CAWDOR: My Lords, no one can rise to address your Lordships on this most important question without feeling strongly the wish that we were discussing a measure of temperance to which we could all give our adhesion and our vote. None of us can but feel the great evils of the drink problem and its great difficulties, and we note, and note with sympathy, how strongly those who know most of the evils of this traffic speak of it in your Lordships' House. No one can realise as well as those who live in every day communication with the working classes in the largest of our towns, how great that evil is.

I was a little sorry that my noble friend who spoke last from the front Ministerial bench should have thought it incumbent upon him to try and lay down that we upon this side of the House had not as closely at heart the true interests of the temperance question as noble Lords opposite. I decline to hold any opinion of that kind. Both sides of the House are, I am convinced, animated with the same wish. We only differ, though we differ strongly, as to the remedy which should be applied to the disease. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Duchy dethroned my noble leader and put in his place the noble and learned Earl who until recently sat upon the Woolsack. I was not aware that the leadership of our party had been so changed. I have always recognised, and I think I recognise still, as one of the most loyal followers and colleagues of the noble Marquess, the late Lord Chancellor. But we do not mind the noble Lord amusing himself with a little banter at our expense. When we consider this great question we cannot avoid feeling that there are two aspects in which it is regarded. I think that was pointed to, to some extent, by the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Southwark. The right rev. Prelate referred to two ways in which these matters were considered—one, I think he said, was more the aspect of sentiment and the other more the aspect of reason. I have the greatest sympathy with the sentiments which guide most people with regard to this great question, but I think we must guard ourselves strongly against one thing. Let our hearts beat in sympathy with all these troubles, but our heads must not be dominated and over-ruled by our hearts.

We are often told, as we were to-night by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Duchy, that we on this side have not at heart the interests of true licensing reform. Does the noble Lord quite forget the Act of 1902, an Act of which hardly anything has been said in the debates on this subject? That Act dealt, I think almost for the first time, if not absolutely for the first time, with the ordinary drunkard. It was the first time that Parliament provided for the apprehension of a man for being drunk when the drinking was unaccompanied by violence. That was a step in advance in dealing with the drunkard. The Act of 1902 also dealt with the record of convictions of drunken persons, and gave control to the justices over the structures of licensed premises. There has been some criticism as to those powers not being sufficient, but that was the first time that these powers were given to justices at all. We had, further, in that same Act the registration of clubs.

Then let me pass from the Act of 1902 to the Act of 1904. In that Act we provided for a reduction of licences, and for the levy upon licence-holders for compensation in respect of licences that were abolished. It is really difficult, looking to these two Acts and to the points which they touch, in certain cases for the first time, to say that the authors of them and those who supported them, were not in sympathy with true temperance reform. The noble Earl, Lord Lytton, in the course of his interesting and able speech this afternoon, criticised a good deal the Act of 1904. I do not propose to follow him at length into his criticisms. I think the noble Earl was hardly fair to that Act, for he seemed to put upon it all the deficiencies of the licensing system up to the present time. That Act may have its faults and shortcomings, but it certainly made a large stride in the direction in which licensing reform appears to be tending to-day. I do not propose to go closely into the actual figures of reduction, but I think I am entitled to claim that, in the matter of reduction, the Act made a considerable advance upon what was the case before, and this reduction has been carried out by the local authorities, with knowledge of the districts over which they had control, at the cost of the trade and to the injury of nobody. Fault has been found, of course, that the Act is not going fast enough. There seems to be a great hurry in legislative matters just now. Surely you had better leave an Act which is working fairly well to work a little longer before you absolutely condemn it for not going fast enough. There would be no difficulty in quickening its steps hereafter if it is really found to be going too slow.

I wish to say a word or two with regard to the allegation of slowness in the working of this Act. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London, in the eloquent speech which he made in this debate, stated that under the Act of 1904 30,000 licences could not, in his opinion, possibly be extinguished in under 100 years. An answer to that statement is to be found in what has been done in the county of Lancashire. In that county the licensing committee took this question up in 1905, and went to great trouble to ascertain what the reasonable requirements of the various districts were and the total number of licences which might ultimately be reduced. They held a personal inspection of the county accompanied by the police, and, after going into the whole question with great carefulness, they gave it as their opinion that out of 4,080 licences 763 should be reduced. Reduction has been going on up to the present time, and the Lancashire Licensing Committee expressed the opinion that all licences in their area which are redundant could be abolished, under the present law, within fifteen years of the present time.

I now turn to this Bill. After the many able speeches to which your Lordships have listened I am not going to detain you by going through the whole of the Bill. I think we may take as its foundation the time-limit, and bound up with the time-limit is what we consider inadequate compensation. This compensation is to be paid by a levy, and those who pay the levy are, instead of gaining some advantage in the future for paying it, to pay it and get no advantage from the payment whatever. Then, my Lords, after the time-limit we find the existing licence holder placed in exactly the same position as the new applicant. You are going to tax the existing licence-holder on the assumption, I presume, that he is paying for a something of value. But that something you propose to make worthless; you put him in competition with the new applicant who comes with capital at his command, with no capital invested in the trade, and absolutely free to accept the terms or to walk away unharmed. I can conceive nothing more unjust than that.

Then behind all this, local option looms up in the future. If local option is such an excellent thing, why do not His Majesty's Government tackle it and make use of it at once? They let it slide. They propose to inflict upon a generation twenty or twenty-one years hence the local option which they do not wish to have to-day. I should have thought the generation to come might have taken care of itself, and been allowed to say whether or not it would have local option. The main idea of this Bill appears to be that there is to be a great quickening in the reduction of licensed houses. How is that to be brought about? It is to be brought about, first of all, by setting aside the local authority and putting in its place a Commission with no local knowledge of any sort or kind, and it is to be pushed ahead by a rigid rule laid down in a Schedule as to the reductions that are to take place. I shall be told that is not absolutely correct. I admit that, so far as the Schedule of reductions is concerned, there is a discretion in the Bill. But it is impossible to suppose that any very great stress is to be laid upon the discretion in the note to the Schedule, and for this reason—if you once begin to tamper to any extent with the rules laid down in the Schedule you will absolutely destroy the Schedule altogether. I am afraid the calculations have not been sufficiently carefully made, or His Majesty's Government would have found that the computation in the Second Schedule is not at all accurate or at all a possible calculation upon which you can work. I repeat that if you begin to tamper with your Schedule according to your footnote you absolutely destroy your Schedule and you must start afresh; and it is quite clear that His Majesty's Government had no intention of having it tampered with, because in another place, during the discussions of Clause 1 in Committee, Amendments were rejected, at the instance of the Government, which proposed to enable the justices to adjust on-licences in proportion to the population. There is, therefore, no intention of giving a wide discretion to get away from the Schedule.

I pass from the consideration of how the reduction is to be quickened by machinery to consider how it is to be quickened by cash; and here you are going to get the same amount of money under the levy—perhaps more—and you are going to give less compensation to the unfortunate owners of licensed houses, because you are going to compensate them on the basis of assessment under Schedule A instead of taking the market value of their trade. Therefore you are going to get your quickening at the cost, not of the public, but of the trade. We have heard a great deal of a high-sounding phrase, and the noble Earl who introduced this Bill quoted it himself. The noble Earl called our attention to the phrase in the Report of the Royal Commission that—

> "There is hardly any sacrifice too great which would result in a marked diminution of this national degradation."

Many of us feel that there might be very great sacrifices indeed if we could be satisfied that those sacrifices and the legislation embodying them would bring about a great diminution of the drink curse of the country. But in the speeches that we have had in this House during the last few days there has been nothing whatever to show that what is proposed in this Bill would bring that diminution about.

Speaker after speaker, and those particularly who are strong advocates of the Bill, have been bound to admit that there is no real proof on which they can say that reduction of houses according to population has in the past or is sure in the future to bring about a reduction of drunkenness. In this Bill there is sacrifice, but it does not fall upon the public, who are supposed to wish the reduction to take place, and it does not fall upon the State, which says the sacrifice cannot be too great. The burden is placed on one class alone. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London described the state of some of the slums and how disheartening it was to see what was going on night after night in the public-houses in them. He spoke of public-houses as being "crammed with a mass of struggling humanity." That must be a most painful scene, and represents a great evil, not only by showing that these people will and must have drink, but as showing that the places where they get their drink now are in some cases so overcrowded that it is almost impossible properly to control them, whether by the police or by those in charge of the house.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON: I was referring specially to a Sunday afternoon. I did not mean that it was always so.

EARL CAWDOR: I was not quite clear whether the right rev. Prelate meant every day, but I would ask whether we can hope that by closing public-houses in that district we are going to cure that evil. By diminishing accommodation you will increase the struggling mass. People who will struggle for drink in that uncomfortable way will get it elsewhere—perhaps free from supervision, and possibly by taking to drinking spirits in their own houses. I press this matter because I feel most strongly that there is much to be said as between licensed houses and clubs—I mean clubs set up for the purposes of drinking, of which, as we know, there are very many. In many parts they are a great and growing evil.

I want, if I may, to refer to two matters which I think bear upon this. I ask your Lordships to note the result of an experiment in India. Thirty years ago there was in the Army there the close canteen system. The soldiers were given two pints of beer and no more. What was the result? The result of the close canteen system was the drinking of arrack and other poisonous spirits, leading to a large amount of drunkenness. In 1874 a battery of artillery went out to India and an experiment was then tried. Instead of continuing the close canteen, the open canteen was tried, the men being allowed to get what they chose to buy. The result was that in a very short time drunkenness in that battery practically disappeared. The drinking of arrack ceased, and from that day to this the system of the open canteen has been extended all over the British Army. This experiment shows that restrictive measures often work exactly in the opposite direction from that in which they were expected to tend. When, also, I think in the time of the noble and gallant Field-Marshal (Lord Roberts), institutes for soldiers were started in India, they were, if not absolutely attached to the canteen, an addition to it. Instead of the canteen being made the principal attraction for the soldier, the institute alongside became the main attraction. The result has been a most happy one, for the institutes have tended to the diminution of the drinking habit among soldiers, while leading them to take up intellectual and other pursuits.

I would also refer to what was said by my noble friend Lord Halifax last night with regard to this particular point. It was, I think, the shortest speech in the whole of this debate, and I am sure it was not very far off being the best. The noble Viscount stated that in a colliery village he knew in Yorkshire, a man familiar with the habits of the miners and noted for his splendid philanthropic work was striving to get a public-house with its comforts established in the village, because the clubs were getting an absolute hold of the men. Reformers must not, therefore, rely too much on wiping out the public-house, which, after all, may have its uses in our social economy. I would point out also to the Bishop of London that the rejection of this Bill would not alter the present position of the licence-holder by giving him as the right rev. Prelate feared, a freehold in the licence. Parliament will be left free to deal with the licence in future, and instead of the trade being placed in an impregnable position the outlook will have become really more clear.

We are often told that we might have amended the Bill. What is it that noble Lords opposite expected us to amend? What would the noble Earl the Leader of the House accept? Noble Lords want to see our Amendments. I think they have been clearly told that there are some grave points which, if unamended, would compel us to throw out the Bill even on the Third Reading stage. No sign has been given by the Government whether or not they would take up and consider any Amendments. We object to the Bill because of its main provisions, because of its time-limit and compensation clauses. There are, however, many points of real licensing reform which we would gladly try to pass if there was the slightest hope of assistance from the Government. I recognise the value of the children clause and the Sunday trading clause, but I am unable to understand how such ardent reformers of the drink traffic as the Government are have failed to deal with the grocers' licences in this Bill. I do not think I am doing him an injustice when I say that the noble Earl the Leader of the House brushed aside the question of grocers' licences as not bearing to any perceptible extent on drunkenness.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): I think what I said was that the case against grocers' licences was not proven.

EARL CAWDOR: Yes; but if not proven the case might be dealt with very much in the same way as the Government are now dealing with other cases that are not proven. Noble Lords opposite are always sheltering themselves behind the opinion of experts, behind those who have lived among the people and who have studied this question. The Bishops of London and Bristol have told the House that the greatest evil to be contended against now is the drunkenness caused by the grocers' licences. Then there is the provision as to clubs. If the Government are going to change so drastically the position of the licensed house, it is absolutely necessary to legislate further for clubs in order to get rid of the grave discrepancies that exist between the public-houses and them.

Lastly, I hope we may be able to come to some agreement as to the valuable Bill of Lord Lamington. A strong desire prevails that something should be done in the direction indicated by that measure to remove the restrictions which hamper the improvement of the public-house. Your Lordships will remember the speech of the Bishop of Birmingham. He told us that he had been in the habit of sitting for a number of hours in German public-houses. He found them very pleasant places, and expressed a wish that it might be possible to have something of the kind in this country. In the dim and not distant future may we hope that some of us may live to see the right rev. Prelate and his brethren on the episcopal bench, perchance not in their robes but distinguished by those garments by which they are so easily recognised, sitting together with their wives and families at the stone tables which we know so well, taking whatever refreshments may seem good to them—not in Germany, but in London, and without a whisper of condemnation from Church people at home. But I have my doubts whether this Bill is going to help forward that happy realisation. Still, if we could arrive at agreement on Lord Lamington's Bill we might yet hope to see that charming picture in the flesh.

May I say a few words as to the remarkable speech we heard last night from the noble Earl on the cross benches? Lord Rosebery is quoted by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Duchy as the great independent authority whose speech of last night is going to show the country how right the Government are and how wrong is the action of my noble friend and ourselves on this side. Lord Rosebery said he was absolutely in favour of the Bill, and that he had no shadow of doubt about voting for it. He then proceeded to discuss it rather fully. He said—

> "I have not the slightest doubt as to my vote, not for all the details of the Bill but certainly for the fundamental principle that underlies the Bill."

He went on to say that the time-limit was the fundamental principle that underlies the Bill. That may be and probably is so, but linked up with the time-limit is surely the question of compensation. A time-limit would not be wanted unless you were coming at some time to the end of it, at which date your compensation is to stop. Therefore if you take the time-limit as a fundamental principle of the Bill, I venture to say you must interweave also the compensation clauses which are bound together with it.

Let us see what followed in the noble Earl's speech. He acknowledged that interests had been built up with the permission of the State, and he went on to say that logically, that being so, the State should pay the compensation. He said—

> "The State having allowed this state of things to grow up, in strict logic it should pay the compensation or most of the compensation, It has allowed and tolerated this understanding it has almost encouraged it, and why should the burden be laid on others which is due only to that amorphous being that is called the State."

The noble Earl continued—

> "But that is outside the region of practical politics. In the first place, the State could not afford it."

What does that mean? You have an admission that there is an interest entitled to compensation, a statement that the State is responsible for that interest and the right to compensation, and there is set up against it this extraordinary tenet, that that is outside of practical politics because "the State cannot afford it." Is it possible that the justification of that is that the State does not wish to pay what it thinks necessary, and therefore will not face the obligation—that the obligation has to be faced not by the State, but by the victims of the legislation you are trying to pass? Could there be a stronger condemnation of this measure than that?

The noble Earl went on to use very remarkable words, particularly for one who has had his experience. He talked of the trade poisoning the sources of our political and municipal life. That is a strongish phrase of itself, but the noble Earl went on to elaborate it and everyone is aware how much the noble Earl knows of political and municipal life. He proceeded to say—I am quoting from *The Times*—

> "No one can have been engaged in municipal life for any time or almost in any community without seeing that the candidates are chosen, not with reference to their purity, but entirely in deference to their subserviency to the trade."

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I do not wish to interrupt the noble Earl. He should omit the article. I said "candidates are chosen" not "the candidates are chosen."

EARL CAWDOR: I do not see the difference.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: The difference is between universal and occasional.

EARL CAWDOR: I contend that that is a sweeping and unwarrantable charge. I agree that you may destroy the value of the interest in question by legislation, but, if you do, you will be doing an injustice absolutely unworthy of the State. We have been told by several noble Lords who sit, some of them on this side and some on the other, that we are doing a very bad service—I think the actual word used is that we are doing a disservice—to property generally by linking it up with this particular trade. I think that may be put too high. We admit that this property or this interest is, in certain ways, on a different footing from other property. But I am not afraid to mix up this particular property with property generally. It is said that this is a less important property than freehold, but if you deal in an unjust way with this kind of property the precedent may very easily spread to more valuable property of every sort and kind throughout the country. Therefore, we are doing no disservice to other kinds of property in standing up for the rights of smaller people when their rights are unjustly and inequitably attacked.

Threats are often hurled at your Lordships' House. That is nothing new to us.

We are accustomed to autumn campaigns, and I do not know that we are very much the worse for them. I sometimes think we are rather the better. But strong language has been used recently by one of His Majesty's Ministers. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, speaking at Bristol a short time ago, used language which in ordinary life one would call distinctly aggressive. I would venture to suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that instead of flourishing the banner of threat against the House of Lords, it would be far better in the interests of the country if he would retire to Ireland and exercise his authority there on those who very much need it. Common sense and common honesty condemn this Bill; and because the Bill is unjust, and therefore wrong, I trust your Lordships will not accord to it a Second Reading.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I think it will be in accordance with your Lordships' natural inclinations if I should not at this time of the day take any very long time in replying on behalf of His Majesty's Government. My first instinct when I learnt that the death-blow had been administered to this Bill at Lansdowne House was that there must be complete unreality in everything that took place in the three days that the Bill was to be discussed on Second Reading. But on reflection I thought, and experience has confirmed it, that many speeches of very great interest would be delivered, although the discussion is purely academic, for the decision is foreseen and foreknown.

There have been two classes of question raised—one not very much adverted to, but naturally raised, on which I shall say only a word, and that is the constitutional aspect of the proceedings which have taken place. My Lords, I venture to say that since the Reform Bill of 1832, your Lordships' House has seldom thrown out upon Second Reading any Bill of first-rate importance which has come recommended by a considerable majority in the House of Commons. The Home Rule Bill was supported by a very small majority in the other House, but I do not recollect any other Bill of first-rate importance since 1832 which was so treated. Unless my memory is at fault, the resistance of the House of Lords to the Reform Bill of 1832 itself was not by throwing out the Bill on Second Reading, but was after taking and amending it.

Here is a Bill which comes from the House of Commons by a majority of 200 or 300, supported by practically all of those who are sent up especially to represent labour—that is to say, those classes by whom public-houses are most used. It comes after protracted sittings between February and November during the whole year, and this House will not entertain it on Second Reading. I think that is a very bad precedent, and I think it is inconsistent with the course that your Lordships' House has pursued ever since the Reform Bill of 1832. But, after all, that constitutional point is one from which I pass, for it is one of minor importance.

I come to the merits of the Bill. It is a measure of enormous magnitude and complexity. Every kind of objection upon detail has been invoked against a Second Reading. It is impossible for me to correct the many, many misapprehensions that have been expressed. It cannot be done. Noble Lords have no doubt perfectly honestly endeavoured to follow it, and I admit it is a difficult subject; but I assure your Lordships that there are many points which you have thoroughly misunderstood or been misinformed about in regard to the scope of the Bill. I am not saying that by way of appeal. I am perfectly aware that the Bill is as dead as a door-nail.

But will your Lordships allow me very shortly to present, not particular details, but a general view of what the Government meant and mean by the Bill? It seems to me the only way to counteract the misapprehensions that exist. In the first place, why did we bring in the Bill at all? I do not believe I am a fanatic. I am not aware that I am prepossessed that way. I do not regard any canon against drinking as a necessary eleventh Commandment. I have no ambition to add to the Decalogue in that respect. But I am a man of business, a man of the world, I hope, and I can see the evils that are going on around us, and the dangerous and frightful consequences to this country in all their aspects arising from this mischief of drink. I see also that there is a direct conflict in some respects between the interests of this trade and the interests of the State. I have no intention of making any attack upon the trade, but their interest is that people should drink. Short of drunkenness, the more people drink the better for the trade. The interest of the State, on the other hand, is that the consumption of liquor should be greatly restricted.

Consider what the actual state of things is. The drink bill is £166,000,000. Ten per cent. of that would more than pay for half the cost of our Navy. Compare it with Canada. We drink four times as much as Canada. I make allowances for the difference of the climate, though that is not wholly favourable to us, and the difference in social circumstances. If we drank, not quarter, but a half of what we do, the people of this country would be better off by £83,000,000. There are very few families in this country, I suppose very few in this House, in which either members of the family themselves, or servants, or dependants have not been victims of this frightful curse and been the cause of infinite misery in the circles in which they live. We all know that, though it does not appear in any record or statistics.

But if you come to statistics, to the microscopic examination which has been made of the social fabric during the last twenty years, into every branch of it, the results are appalling. With regard to prisons, the Bishop of London told us that 93 per cent. of the inmates were there in consequence of drink. I spoke to a Judge of Assize not long ago, not of my way of thinking in politics, so far as Judges, except the Lord Chancellor, are permitted to have political opinions, and I asked him how many of the cases that came before him at the last assize were due to drink. He said eleven out of twelve directly, and the twelfth indirectly. In the case of disease, any doctor will tell your Lordships of the mischief which they see arise in their circle of patients. In lunacy, according to the last Report of the Lunacy Commission, 22 per cent. of the men confined in lunatic asylums were there directly by reason of drink, to say nothing of the multitudes who owe their lunacy to hereditary disease caused by drink. The Manchester investigation showed that 51 per cent. of the workhouse inmates were there in consequence of drink. The Report of the Royal Commission on Housing shows that bad housing and drink act and re-act so much on one another that it is impossible to tell which is the cause and which is the effect. The best opinion in regard to cases of cruelty to children is that anything up to 90 per cent. of the cases of cruelty are due to drink.

In regard to physical deterioration, your Lordships may have read the reports on that subject, and there you will have found drink described as a potent and deadly agent. Lastly, the noble Marquess referred to the influence of drink upon unemployment which we cannot possibly fathom, but of which you will find this, that although there are many fine fellows lamentably situated, deserving work but unable to get it, one of the difficulties in providing for them is that there is also a number of unemployable people, unemployable because of drink, whose condition and number interfere with giving proper employment to the others. It has been for years my habit to read all I can find of reports on social subjects, and I have formed this opinion, that if only this mischief could be dealt with effectually, whether by one party or the other, I care not which, 75 per cent. of the social evils in this country would settle themselves. What strikes me with astonishment and regret is this, that in this House, where I know, and we all know, there are many men who give large sums and spend much labour and time and thought in rescuing people who have come to trouble by reason of this frightful vice, they seem not to see the necessity, and, if I may respectfully say so, the common-sense of trying to stop these people by any means they can before they fall over the precipice. It is astonishing to me that when there are so many who are willing to do everything for such people, they should fail to see that good and wise laws of this kind will prevent people from falling. So much for the mischief.

These things show the extreme danger of this trade with which we are dealing, and our forefathers have always recognised from the first time when licences were granted that it is absolutely necessary to control this trade, to watch it, and not to allow it to obtain an insidious influence in any direction. The Amendment of the noble Marquess admits the necessity and propriety of dealing with this evil of intemperance. The framer of the Amendment seems to think that the Bill will not materially improve the state of things which exists. Is that so? In the first place, let me say what has come out in this debate. Of many of the minor portions of the Bill there has been a chorus of approbation from all quarters of the House. Particular reference has been made to Sunday closing so far as it goes in the Bill—I believe only thirty-nine Members of the House of Commons were found to vote against it. So far as I can make out, there would not be any Members of this House who would oppose it. Statutory conditions are also proposed to give control over the arrangement of premises and access to them, and to deal with the later opening of houses in the morning. There are provisions to forbid children from being admitted to bars, for closing houses on election days, and for preventing beer being hawked in vans all over the country. No one is otherwise than favourable to all these provisions; indeed, everyone approves of them.

Then there are the provisions as to clubs. Everyone approves of them so far as they go. In my opinion clubs are a very dangerous element, especially when you are going to suppress public-houses, and this Bill proposes to extend the time before which no house closed as a public-house shall be opened as a club; and it will effectually prevent the control by brewers of clubs. But some of your Lordships think that these clubs clauses should be made stronger. Well, I hope my colleagues will forgive me for saying that I myself heartily wish they could be made stronger, and if that were done you would have no more willing supporter than myself. No one denies that these clauses so far as they go are good. It is the same with the off-licences. It may be, as some people think, that the provisions in regard to off-licences are not strong enough. Very well, why not make them stronger? The cumulative effect of these proposals will be very greatly in the direction of temperance, and that has not been denied from any quarter of the House.

What justification, then, is there for rejection of these clauses? There has been a reference to privilege. What is the position as between this House and the House of Commons in regard to matters of privilege? Your Lordships can protect yourselves perfectly against any abuse of privilege. Supposing this Bill had gone into Committee; supposing there were a great number of privileged clauses, which I am bound to say to my mind do not seem so numerous as they seem to be in the estimation of some noble Lords; and suppose your Lordships amended the clauses and returned them to the House of Commons and that the House of Commons then claimed privilege: that means simply that the House of Commons refuses to assent to your Amendments; you are still absolutely free to reject the Bill, to refuse to pass it into law. I cannot understand the argument when you have a Bill with a great deal of good in it and some features which you may consider bad, why in the name of common-sense you ought to reject the good, on the theory that you cannot separate the good from the bad, when in point of fact you can do one of two things; you can either insist on having only the good retained, or you can do what you are asked to do now—throw out the Bill. Of all the arguments ever put forward to justify a strange constitutional precedent, that of rejecting a Bill of this magnitude and with these antecedents in such a way is one of the strangest I ever heard, and I cannot help thinking that the prospect is not appreciated by noble Lords who adopt it.

So much for the good parts of the Bill; for people have become aware that there are good points in the Bill, and I wish this had been recognised earlier during weary sittings in the House of Commons when many of these things now said to be boons were regarded with very different feelings. Who will answer for the opinion of the House of Commons as to how they would treat these clauses if they were sent back to the House of Commons; who will answer for the time that will be spent—and, as your Lordships know, time is now the most precious Parliamentary possession that can be imagined?

Why, some day people will recoginse that we are trying to do three or four times as much business in the House of Commons than can possibly be done. I speak with respect, with the utmost respect, for the House of Commons, where I sat twenty-six years, and they were among the happiest years of my life; but what is the position? This Bill was closured in that House, and I am glad to see, and I think it is very creditable to the good feeling of noble Lords, that that circumstance has hardly been alluded to. It was the same with the Bill of 1904; that Bill was closured, and I remember making a protest against it. We all do that, but I most bitterly regret the closuring of this Bill. But the reign of closure has come to stay in the House of Commons until such time as both parties in the State will see that it is necessary to have some effective instrument in order to get rid of bad laws or to make good laws when they are needed.

I pass from that subject now and turn to other parts of the Bill. There is that part relating to reduction of licences; that is the portion which has been so strongly condemned. It is said to be futile, predatory, and vindictive. Now will you allow me to examine the principle on which this reduction rests—not going into detail, not dealing with Committee points, but dealing only with principle? I will say nothing of the Kennedy judgment, which has been dealt with in the admirable speech of Lord Lytton. I think I could satisfy your Lordships that it was contrary to the expressed intention of the framers of the Act of 1904. I will not say anything about the length of the time-limit. I am not sanguine enough to suppose that in any length of time I could persuade your Lordships by statistical examination that the period of time in the Bill is fitting. I am not dealing with the amount of compensation or the time-limit; if ever there were things appropriate for Committee examination they are such as these.

I deal with the principles of the Bill, and I will tell your Lordships why we propose the reduction of licences and what was the course of reasoning that induced me to accept the view introduced in the Bill. The first principle is that it is necessary to reduce the number of licences, that is the indispensable preliminary to reform in the liquor trade. Is that denied? The last speaker (Earl Cawdor) either denied it or threw cold water upon it. Lord St. Aldwyn said it is a principle which has been accepted by both parties. The noble Marquess (Lord Lansdowne) stated it is indispensable, but it is a principle which must be treated with discrimination. Well, yes; everything in this world must be treated with discrimination. The Bill of 1904 proceeded upon the same doctrine. I remember perfectly well the discussions on that Bill and the bitter resistance I offered to it, for I knew and foresaw exactly the kind of argument that would be based upon it, and I thought better leave the trade to make its own insurance against future liabilities. How was that Bill defended? It is true something was given to the trade, but look at the enormous and inestimable blessings to be derived from the reduction of licences. It is true, and no one has denied it, that the prospective reduction was the great thing put forward; are we to have it contradicted and denied now? It has not been denied by your Lordships. I know it has been said by Lord Robertson that you cannot establish a statistical and conclusive proof of it. Of course you cannot; if you can prove that by statistics, you can prove anything by statistics.

Everyone familiar with this subject, including noble Lords on the front Opposition bench, as well as bishops and members of the Government, knows perfectly well that you must reduce the number of public-houses for a variety of reasons. Because they offer temptations, because they escape control; because, as Lord Lytton pointed out, they make people drive the trade if there are many houses in competition, and competition makes a pushing trade, often an illegitimate trade. That is the first reason why we started with a reduction of licences as indispensable. Then it may be said: "Why such a reduction?" What was the reduction anticipated under the Act of 1904? The Marquess of Salisbury, then a member of the Cabinet, I remember, said that he expected the reduction would be about 2,500 a year. That estimate has not been realised, and I am sorry for it; it has only come up to

1,096; the Kennedy judgment required too large compensation. What is the reduction contemplated under this Bill? 2,200, a less reduction than was contemplated by the framers of the 1904 Act. The next proposition is that the reduction shall be regulated by statute and at the cost of the trade; there is nothing new in this, it was in the Bill of 1904.

I will not enter at length into the *quantum* or quality of the property or interest created by licences; far be it from me to enter on such a subject now; it would be mere trifling with words; what took place is the important thing. Previous to 1904, a licence was annual and nothing more, and there was a right to take a licence away if there was redundancy. In 1904 it was provided there should be no withdrawal of the licence in case of good conduct without compensation. Attached to that was the liability of the trade to find the money for compensation. Hence there is no doubt that it was recognised that an interest was created by the licence of the State; but it existed only so long as a monopoly or restricted trade was permitted, which could be destroyed tomorrow by free trade in licences, and was of such a nature that all parties agreed that if it were taken away compensation must come from the pockets of fellow traders. Those are the facts we drew our conclusions from. It is an anomalous and exceptional kind of property, this property in a licence, and of an entirely different description from ordinary property.

I now come to the third principle which we thought was necessary; and that was that at some time—I do not enter upon the question of what time—it was in the imperative interest of the State that this exceptional and anomalous right of renewal should disappear, and that the State should resume the power to refuse the licence in the public interest, unfettered by the existence of any vested right of property at all. Is that a strong proposition? I understood Lord St. Aldwyn to indicate that the time should be nearer twenty-eight years than fourteen years. I did not understand the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition to say it would be wrong to resume it at any time. I therefore put this to your Lordships in good faith: Are you prepared to lay down the rule that because an annual licence was treated as a property of that kind in the Act of 1904—contrary to the vehement opposition of some of us—the people of England are to be subjected to that burden for ever? Surely it cannot be that your Lordships would desire that the position created by the Act of 1904 should be in perpetuity a huge obstacle to every kind of experiment in temperance reform. If that is so, I hope we are not far from one another in this—that a time may come at some date, the sooner the better, I think, when the State shall be at liberty to resume the right which it had for 400 years, and which, if the counsels of wiser men had been adopted, it would still have had unqualified, to treat licences apart from any vested interest.

My fourth proposition is that this can only be done by exacting the monopoly value. Every statute that was passed from the commencement of our licensing history down to 1904—I do not refer to the ante-1869 licences—spoke in the most unequivocal terms of the annual licence as a licence for one year and no more. These three words "and no more" indicated the desire on the part of those who have gone before us to make it clear that the licensee had no right in the licence beyond one year. Nevertheless, a claim to a vested interest grew up; and the only way to prevent the renewal of another vested interest is to say, as the late Government said in the Act of 1904, that there should be a payment for monopoly value in the case of existing and in the case of new licences.

I now come to the last principle of all. We came to the conclusion that it was necessary to have a scheme for all England and not a scheme only for county by county. The reason for that is very obvious. There is a great disparity in the density of licences in different parts of the United Kingdom. In London, there are districts where there is a licence for every 1,500 or 2,000 of the population. There are some places again where the number of licences is a perfect scandal, where there is one licence for every 150 or 160 adult inhabitants. If you do not have some system by which you would be able to pool all the receipts from the different levies all over the country and apply them so that the entire country shall have the benefit, you will never get rid of the worst cases of excessive licences, which are in the slums of our great cities. For that purpose, and that purpose alone, it is necessary to have a Commission to co-ordinate the schemes of suppression sent up to them by the local justices; to keep the whole of England in their hands for financial purposes; to see that the levy is sufficient to go round, and not for the purpose of dictating to the local justices what house shall or shall not be shut. It is said: What right have you to take from Devonshire money in order to spend it in London? But if it is lawful and honest, as it is at present under the Act of 1904, to take money raised by levy on the north coast of Devon and spend it in Plymouth on the south coast, why is it wicked to take it from Cornwall and spend it elsewhere? These canons of ethics are too subtle for me.

These are the principles contained in the Bill, stripped of the multiplicity of necessary detail, and I maintain that so far as these principles are concerned, every one of them has been supported by declarations of the leaders of the Conservative Party, and illustrated in the legislation which they themselves have passed. The fate of the Bill I know is decided. It is not altogether in the interest of the Government, believe me, that I object to the course which has been taken by the leader of the Opposition. I know very well that the subject is unpopular, and it may have influenced the recent bye-elections. But I think it is our duty to stand by the Bill, no matter how many bye-elections may have gone against us. No Government will lose in the long run by holding to what it believes to be honest and right. If you can show us that we are wrong why have you not gone into Committee and considered the details of the Bill, so that we may convince you, or be convinced by you? What right have you to suppose that we are desirous of acting dishonestly by any trade? We shall be overwhelmed of course. But with all respect to the noble Marquess who leads the Opposition, and I feel a real respect for him, I say it will not be to his honour, it will not be to his credit, that this Bill is rejected, for it is the triumph of a trade over the community, it is the victory of wrong over right.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out, stand part of the Question."

On Question, Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 96; Not-Contents, 272.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

York, L. Abp.

Crewe, E. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Manchester, D.

Normanby, M.
Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Craven, E.
De La Warr, E.
Dundonald, E.
Durham, E.
Fortescue, E.
Kimberley, E.
Liverpool, E.
Lytton, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.
Stamford, E.

Temple, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Cobham, V.
Esher, V.
Falmouth, V.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)
Milner, V.
Morley of Blackburn, V.
Peel, V.
Selby, V.

Birmingham, L. Bp.
Chester, L. Bp.
Hereford, L. Bp.
Liverpool, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Norwich, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
Southwark, L. Bp.
Wakefield, L. Bp.

Airedale, L.
Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Balfour, L.

Blyth, L.
Boston, L.
Brassey, L.
Braye, L.
Burghclere, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Courtney of Penwith, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Eversley, L.
Farrer, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Hemphill, L.
Herschell, L.
Joicey, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Knollys, L.
Loch, L.
Lochee, L.
Lucas, L.
Lyveden, L.
MacDonnell, L.

Marchamley, L.
Mendip, L. (*V. Clifden.*)
Monkswell, L.
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Nunburnholme, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Pirrie, L.
Reay, L.
Rendel, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Ritchie of Dundee, L.
Rodeny, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
St. Davids, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Swaythling, L.
Tenterden, L.
Wandsworth, L.
Weardale, L.
Welby, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)
Bedford, D.
Brandon, D. (*D. Hamilton.*)
Devonshire, D.
Grafton, D.
Leeds, D.
Marlborough, D.
Newcastle, D.
Northumberland, L.
Portland, D.
Richmond and Gordon, D.
Rutland, D.
Somerset, D.
Sutherland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abergavenny, M.
Ailesbury, M.
Anglesey, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Cholmondeley, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Linlithgow, M.
Salisbury, M.
Zetland, M.

Albemarle, E.
Ancaster, E.
Aylesford, E.
Bathurst, E.
Brownlow, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cairns, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Carnwath, E.
Cathcart, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cottenham, E.
Coventry, E.
Cowley, E.
Cranbrook, E.
Cromer, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Darnley, E.
Dartrey, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Eldon, E.
Ellesmere, E.
Essex, E.
Feversham, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Guilford, E.
Haddington, E.
Halsbury, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrowby, E.
Howe, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Ilchester, E.
Innes, E. (*D. Roxburghe.*)
Jersey, E.
Kilmorey, E.
Lathom, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lindsey, E.
Londesborough, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Lovelace, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Mayo, E.
Morley, E.
Morton, E.
Munster, E.
Nelson, E.
Northbrook, E.
Onslow, E.
Orford, E.
Pembroke and Montgomery, E
Plymouth, E.
Powis, E.
Radnor, E.
Roberts, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Sandwich, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Verulam, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Westmeath, E.
Westmorland, E.
Wharncliffe, E.
Wilton, E.
Winchelsea and Nottingham, E.

Bridport, V.
Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Falkland, V.
Goschen, V.
Halifax, V.
Hampden, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hill, V.
Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Iveagh, V.
Portman, V.
Ridley, V.
St. Aldwyn, V.
Templeton, V.
Torrington, V.

Abinger, L.
Addington, L.
Aldenham, L.
Alington, L.
Allerton, L.
Alverstone, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ampthill, L.
Annaly, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Ashcombe, L.
Ashton, L.
Atkinson, L.
Avebury, L.
Bagot, L.
Barnard, L.
Barrymore, L.
Basing, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Bolton, L.
Borthwick, L.
Bowes, L. (*E. Strathmore and Kinghorn.*)
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Braybrooke, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Burton, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Carew, L.
Castlemaine, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Cheylesmore, L.
Churston, L.
Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam.*)
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Collins, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Dawnay, L. (*V. Downe.*)
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
De Ramsey, L.

Deramore, L.
Desborough, L.
Digby, L.
Douglas, L. (*E. Home.*)
Dunmore, L. (*E. Dunmore.*)
Ellenborough, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Erskine, L.
Estcourt, L.
Faber, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Fermanagh, L. (*E. Erne.*)
Forester, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grey de Ruthyn, L.
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen.*)
Harlech, L.
Harris, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hastings, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hawke, L.
Hindlip, L.
Hothfield, L.
Hylton, L.
James, L.
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare.*)
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kensington, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kinross, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Knaresborough, L.
Lawrence, L.
Leconfield, L.
Leigh, L.
Leith of Fvyie, L.
Lilford, L.
Llangattock, L.
Ludlow, L.
Lurgan, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Manners, L.
Massy, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Middleton, L.
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham.*)
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Mount, Stephen, L.
Mowbray, L.
Muncaster, L.
Muskerry, L.
North, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Playfair, L.
Poltimore, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Ramsay, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*)
Ranfurly, L. (*E. Ranfurly.*)
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Revelstoke, L.
Robertson, L.
Rosmead, L.
Rothschild, L.
St. John of Bletsoe, L.
St. Oswald, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sandys, L.
Seaton, L.
Sherborne, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Somerton, L. (*E. Normanton.*)
Southampton, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden and Campbell, L.
Templemore, L.
Teynham, L.
Trevor, L.
Tweeddale, L. (*M. Tweeddale.*)
Vaux of Harrowden, L.
Vivian, L.
Waleran, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wenlock, L.
Westbury, L.
Wigan, L. (*E. Crawford.*)
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Wolverton, L.
Worlingham, L. (*E. Gosford.*)
Wynford, L.

"Resolved, This House, while ready to consider favourably any Amendments which experience has shown to be necessary in the law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, declines to proceed further with a measure which, without materially advancing the cause of temperance, would occasion grave inconvenience to many of His Majesty's subjects, and violate every principle of equity in its dealings with the numerous classes whose interests will be affected by the Bill."

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 27th November, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London (Westminster and Kensington) Electric Supply Companies Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (MILITARY OPERATIONS).

Return [presented 26th November] to be printed. [No. 338.]

NATAL.

Copy presented, of Papers relating to the case of Mr. Alfred Mangena [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of April, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No. 2) BILL.

Copy presented, of Draft Regulations under Clause 2 of the Bill [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BUILDING GRANTS.

Copy presented, of further Statement showing the Cases in which the Board of Education have received Applications from Local Education Authorities for Special Grants for the Building of New Public Elementary Schools, and the stage which each Case had reached on 31st October, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS, INCLUDING TELEPHONES.

Account presented, showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the Telegraph Service during the year ended 31st March, 1908, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 339.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Division of Untenanted Land on Estate of Mrs. Shelton at Beaufort.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the grazing lettings on the estate of Mrs. Shelton at Beaufort will end; and when will the Estates Commissioners take over the place and divide the untenanted land on it.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are not at present in a position to furnish the information asked for. The papers in connection with the estate are with their inspector with a view to the preparation of a scheme for the distribution of the lands. The Commissioners cannot take over possession until the scheme has been settled.

Delay in Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants at Lane Joynt Estate.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what is the cause of delay in reinstating the evicted tenants on the estate of Lane Joynt at Aughanish, in the County of Limerick; and why will not the Estates Commissioners put into operation the compulsory provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that proceedings have been instituted for the sale to them of these lands under the provisions of the Irish Land Act, 1903. It would be contrary to the established practice to state the reasons which actuate the Commissioners in the exercise of their discretion.

Distribution of Untenanted Land on the Massey Estate.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what steps the Estates Commissioners have taken to acquire the untenanted land on the Massey estate, situate at Glenville and Ballylin, in the County of Limerick; and whether there is any likelihood of an agreement in the matter being come to.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have had a preliminary inspection made of the lands referred to with a view to intimating to the owner the price they will be prepared to advance if formal proceedings for the sale of the lands are instituted. The Commissioners are not at present in a position to say whether an agreement is likely to be arrived at.

Evicted Tenants—Application of Mrs. B. O'Connell.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Mrs. Bridget O'Connell, of Ards, Ballygran, Charleville, in the County of Limerick, evicted tenant, for a portion of the untenanted lands at Cappananty, on the estate of Captain Lyons; and, if so, whether, having regard to the fact that her people lived on the estate, and also to the fact that she has three sons who are able to work land and who have good recommendations as to character, they will favourably consider her claim.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received an application from Mrs. Bridget Connell in reference to a holding of three and a half acres at one time occupied by her husband. The Commissioners have decided to take no action in the matter.

Delay in Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on the Waller Estate.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what is the cause of delay on the part of the Estates Commissioners in reinstating and making provision for the evicted tenants on the Waller estate at Pallaskenry and other districts in the County of Limerick.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have notified in the Dublin Gazette their intention of acquiring compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act certain lands on the Waller estate. The lands have been inspected, and the Commissioners will, in due course, consider their inspector's report with a view to making an offer under the Act.

Sick Leave of Colonial Office Staff in British East Africa.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a regulation or order has recently been issued in British East Africa by the Colonial Office limiting the period of illness on the sick list for officials to ten days at one time, or twenty-eight days in the year, after which such officials are to be placed on half-pay, and if such order has been incorporated in the provincial gazettes throughout British East Africa.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) Such a regulation was recently issued, but the Secretary of State has approved of its withdrawal, and in future a maximum of forty-five days sick leave per annum will be allowed.

Subsidies to Steamship Lines.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the conditions attaching to a subsidy in Germany for a steamship line prohibit any change in the rate of freight without the consent of the Imperial Chancellor, and in Austria without the consent of the Minister of Commerce; and whether any steps are to be taken in regard to all future subsidies to prevent the undue raising of freights against British traders and any action in restriction of trade.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I am aware that the subsidies granted to certain steamship lines in Germany and Austria have been subject to the condition stated. Payments made to British steamship companies by His Majesty's Government are, generally speaking, payments for services rendered, and their amount would presumably have to be increased if the regulation of freight rates were made an invariable condition. I will consider whether any steps are necessary with regard to the matter when the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings and Conferences has issued its Report.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the President of the Board of Trade in reference to the subsidy agreement of the Cunard Steamship Company of 30th July, 1903, under Part I., Article (5), to carry on its business to the best advantage, not unduly to raise the freights or charges for the carriage of goods in any of its services, and to give no undue preference as against British subjects, what check the Board of Trade are able to impose to see that the agreement is carried out in spirit as well as in letter; whether any conflict of opinion has yet arisen; and whether similar conditions have been imposed in the case of any other subsidy.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Board of Trade carefully investigate any complaints made to them with regard to the freight rates charged by the Cunard Steamship Company, and if there should in any case be reason to suppose that the rate was unduly raised or gave an undue preference as against British subjects the matter would be taken up with the company. There has been no conflict of opinion with regard to this matter between the Board and the company. Conditions regulating to some extent rates of freight are to be found in the contract of 19th April, 1900, with Messrs. Elder Dempster and Company for a steamship service between Jamaica and the United Kingdom (Cd. 175), and in the contract of 29th August, 1907, with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company with respect to the West Indian Inter-Colonial mail service (Parliamentary Paper, No. 24). I understand that the Post Office mail contracts with the

Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company contain clauses prohibiting undue preference being given as against British subjects. The Board have no reason to think that the Cunard Company have not fully complied with the provisions of the agreement both in spirit and letter.

Mr. BELLAIRS: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the Annual Report on the Straits Settlements for the year 1907, and to pages 48 and 49, dealing with the effect on trade due to the action of shipping conferences and the hardships inflicted on British tramp steamers and sailing vessels, which have been almost entirely driven out of a trade in which they used largely to participate; and whether, in the event of no legislation being contemplated by the Government next year in reference to shipping rings and conferences, the Government will consider the advisability of holding a conference, in which the self-governing Colonies and the Dependencies of the Empire may participate, to consider whether it is advisable to strengthen the law in regard to combinations in restraint of free trade or to take any other action.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) My attention has been called to the Report to which my hon. friend refers. The whole question of shipping rings and conferences is at present being inquired into by a Royal Commission. The Report of the Commission will, I understand, be issued shortly, and the advisability of legislative or other action dealing with this subject will then be considered.

The Salvation Army.

Mr. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Salvation Army is registered as a trading company; and, if so, whether it makes the Returns to the Board of Trade as required by the Companies Acts, and whether it supplies the particulars as required by the Census of Production Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Salvation Army is not registered under the Companies Acts and does not make any of the Returns required by those Acts. There is, however, on the register a company limited by guarantee called the Salvation Army Assurance Society, Limited, which renders the Returns required of companies so limited. There are also on the register other companies formed for the purpose of purchasing land and buildings for the use of the Salvation Army in different parts of the United Kingdom. Instances of these are the Southend Citadel Company, Limited, and the Willesden Green Citadel Company, Limited. These Companies are limited by shares and render the Returns required of companies so limited. The Salvation Army is liable to supply particulars under the Census of Production Act in respect of the numerous trades in which it is engaged, and schedules of questions have been issued to it in the ordinary course.

House of Commons—Rooms for Officials.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the First Commissioner of Works if he would enumerate the number of rooms in this House used by Ministers, and Members of Parliament, stating the office or position for which each room is allotted.

(*Answered by Mr. L. Harcourt.*) Rooms are provided for all Ministers, for the Leaders of the Conservative, Unionist, Irish, Welsh, and Labour Parties, and for the Whips of the Government, Opposition, Irish, and Labour Parties.

Government Contracts—Pay of Carpenters.

Mr. W. T. WILSON: To ask the First Commissioner of Works if he is aware that, according to the Report of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, the wages of carpenters and joiners working within a radius of twelve miles of Charing Cross are given as 10½d. per hour; and whether, in view of this fact, he will insist upon all firms who secure Government work within this radius over which he has control paying 10½d. per hour to the carpenters in their employ.

(*Answered by Mr. L. Harcourt.*) The Report referred to gives information furnished to the Board of Trade by associations connected with the building trade. It represents an agreement arrived at between the London Master Builders' Association and the London Trade unions. From the best information I can obtain the rate of 10½d. an hour adopted in this agreement for carpenters is not, to use the language of the Fair Wages Resolution of this House, "generally accepted as current in the trade for competent workmen," as between local employers and workmen, in certain places in the outer fringe of the area within the twelve-mile radius; and it appears that the London associations have not been able to enforce a rate of 10½d. for carpenters in those districts, although in some instances that rate is paid. Having regard to the terms of the Resolution of the House I do not see how I can compel contractors in those districts to pay the 10½d. rate where I find that there is another and lower rate locally current.

Barrow-in-Furness Distress Committee.

MR. BELL (Derby): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state when the distress committee was formed in Barrow-in-Furness; how many unemployed workmen had registered their names on the unemployed register; when did the distress committee apply for a grant from the Government's unemployed fund; when was the grant made; and for how much.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The official papers relating to this matter are in the hands of my inspector who is holding an inquiry to-day at Barrow and I cannot therefore give precise replies to all these Questions. I may say, however, that the distress committee was formed in 1905, that the number of registered applicants on 9th November was 1,757, and that on the 14th instant a payment of £500 was made to the committee, and a similar payment on the 16th.

Lowrybane and Ougherdrum Estates—Restoration of Evicted Tenants.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have acquired, or are in course of acquiring, the lands of Lowrybane and Ougherdrum, near Castlecauldwell, County Fermanagh; and, if so, are these lands untenanted lands, and will they be made available for the restoration of evicted tenants residing in the district, and, amongst others, of John Graham of Banagh, Clonkelly, who lives within a few miles and has a strong and willing family well able to work a holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to his previous Question of 4th February last on this subject. I have nothing to add to that reply at present.

Cost of Irish Land Policy.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will lay upon the Table of the House the calculations which purport to show that £180,000,000 will probably be required for completing the policy of land purchase under the Irish Land Act, 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have not suggested that £180,000,000 will probably be required to complete land purchase. I named that amount as the present estimate of the size of the problem as existing in 1903, assuming that land purchase was to be carried through to completion. A Return showing how that estimate was arrived at will be laid upon the Table in the course of a few days.

Distribution of Grant to Irish National School Teachers.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as the supplementary grant of £114,000 was voted to increase the salaries of all national teachers in Ireland and its distribution regulated by Parliament, he will state on what authority the Commissioners of National Education are acting in imposing new conditions as to the future distribution of the grant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they have imposed no new conditions as to the future distribution of the grant.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate Enactments relating to the Post Office." [Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords].]

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 385.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES.)

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills: Mr. Waldron; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) and the Local Government (Scotland) Bills): Mr. Walrond.

Report to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS ON FRIDAY.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said he wished to ask the Home Secretary a Question of which he had given the right hon. Gentleman private notice.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman is not present.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: May I address it to the Under-Secretary?

*MR. SPEAKER: He is not here.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: That being so, what remedy have I?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member can put down a Question for Monday.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: As there are forty Members present, may I ask leave to call attention to the matter on a Motion for adjournment?

*MR. SPEAKER: The adjournment of the House cannot be moved on Friday.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment of certain Parliamentary Grants in pursuance of any Act of the present session to make further provision with respect to Elementary Education in England and Wales (King's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No 2) BILL) (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The House is aware that it is never to me a congenial task to submit one of these procedure Resolutions, and on the present occasion, for obvious reasons, I approach that duty with exceptional reluctance. The peculiar and, indeed, unique circumstances in which this Bill originated are familiar to all of us, and obviously it could not pass through all its stages in this House without these facilities being given to it. I had at one time hoped it would be possible; but further inquiry has shown me that, in view of the time of year which we have reached, and the necessity of the Bill becoming law promptly, some moderate curtailment of time, and some proper allocation of time, is indispensably necessary. I am quite sure there is not a man on either side in this House who does not know as well as I do that if no such Resolution were adopted there is not the remotest chance of this Bill ever reaching the House of Lords in time for passing into law in the present year. It may be said—Why did we not introduce it earlier? But this Bill, as hon. Gentlemen on both sides know, is the result of prolonged communications and negotiations carried on for months on a subject of very exceptional difficulty, and between parties whose interests for a long time appeared irreconcilable. At the very first moment that those negotiations approached, I will not say a conclusion, but within measurable distance of a conclusion, this Bill was drafted and presented to the House without delay. Therefore, the Government cannot charge themselves with any neglect in this matter. If that be so, and I think I am stating facts which, whatever dialectical arguments we may resort to, are facts familiar to us all and indisputable, the substantial question is whether in the Resolution which I have put down adequate time is given to the discussion of the subject as a whole, and, next, whether a reasonable proportion of time has been given to different branches of the subject. Upon the first point I may remind the House of two things. The subject-matter with which we are dealing is in no sense novel. There is not a single argument relative or material to it which has not done duty on previous Bills on the platform and in the House of Commons. But quite apart from that, as I ventured to remind the House yesterday, the real question which arises in this case is not so much what can be said on the matter of principle for or against these particular provisions, but whether the various provisions, taken together, after proper scrutiny, do or do not constitute a reasonable and satisfactory view of the situation. I think one illustration will show the House what I mean by a perfectly reasonable view of the situation. Take the case which is provided for by the second clause. The proposed right of entry is given for the first time to denominational teachers in provided schools. In our view, whether we are right or wrong, that is an essential part of this compromise. You might discuss for months whether the right of entry is right; but in our view it is an essential and integral part of the arrangement. Therefore, I would submit that any discussion on what I may call the abstract merits at this stage is not a relevant discussion. On the other hand, whether or not the apprehension which I find is expressed in some quarters deserving of the highest respect as to whether the right of entry is or is not clearly defined and adequately safeguarded against possible suppression is well-grounded, is a most material point, and is a matter upon which the Committee might reasonably spend its time. I give that only as an illustration to show what is the true function of the Committee on a Bill presented in such circumstances and with such a peculiar origin as that now before the House. That being so, it appears to us that, large and far-reaching as are the questions of principle raised by these five or six clauses, having regard to their interdependence as part of one scheme, an adequate amount of time will be given in the six days to make perfectly clear anything that is doubtful, to fill up any gaps that may exist, and to strengthen any safeguards that appear insufficiently secure, in order to see that the arrangement as a whole is carried through. I come now to the allocation of time as between the different subjects in the Bill. We propose to give the whole of the first day to the discussion of the first clause, the one that sets up what I may call the general national system, under which all schools assisted by rate aid will require to be under the control of the public authority, with the teachers to be appointed by that authority, and so forth. That is what I may call, using rough and popular language, the great concession to Nonconformist opinion, and no doubt it requires a whole day for its discussion. I am assuming what is to be the proper function of Committee in relation to a Bill of this kind. Nobody would cheer more loudly than I if a solution of the education question could be embodied in a Bill containing only that one clause. On the second day I propose to deal with the second clause, giving what is known as the right of entry. This, to use again popular language, is the granting of the countervailing concession to the denominationalists. On the third day we put forward—and this is most important—the Report stage of the Financial Resolutions. On that can be raised the whole question, dealt with in the Bill and the Schedules, of the present principle and general effect of the proposed financial arrangements, as to whether or not this is a fair bargain with regard to contracting-out schools. This is relative to Clause 3, which is grouped with it, and provides for contracting out. On the fourth day we come to matters that are not unimportant though of subordinate importance. Clauses 4 and 5 provide for the transfer of the existing voluntary schools to the public authority. Clause 6, to be taken in the first part of the next day, deals with the same subject matter and the remainder of that day is given to the three following clauses about which I do not think there is any controversy. Clauses 11 and 12 are formal and will be taken on the last day with Clause 10, which is an important one because it deals with the unification of grants to the local authority. The Schedules will also be taken on that day.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): And the new clauses?

MR. ASQUITH: If there be any.

LORD R. CECIL: There are some on the Paper now.

MR. ASQUITH: I was not aware of that. If there are any new clauses they will be discussed then. I think that is a fair allocation as between the different subject matters of the clauses. If, for the reasons that I have stated, the House agrees, however reluctantly, with the Government that if the Bill is to pass into law some compulsory allocation of time must be made, then I hope that they will further agree that after a good deal of thought we have placed on the Table a reasonable and practicable scheme which they will be disposed to accept. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee Stage, Report stage, and Third Reading of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, and the necessary stages of the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with as follows:—1. Committee stage. Six allotted days shall be given to the Committee stage of the Bill, including the necessary stages of the Financial Resolution relating to the Bill, and the proceedings on each of those allotted days shall be those shown in the second column of the table annexed to this Order, and those proceedings shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at the time shown in the third column of that table. 2. Report stage. Two allotted days shall be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and the proceedings for each of those allotted days shall be such as may be hereafter determined in manner provided by this Order, and those proceedings, if not previously brought to a conclusion, shall be brought to a conclusion at 10.30 p.m. on each such allotted day. 3. Third Reading. One allotted day shall be given to the Third Reading of the Bill, and the proceedings thereon shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at 10.30 p.m. on that day. On the conclusion of the Committee stage the Chairman shall report the Bill to the House without Question put, and the House shall on a subsequent day, consider the proposals made by the Government for the allocation of the proceedings on the Report stage of the Bill. The proceedings on the consideration of those proposals may be entered on at any hour, though opposed, and shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the sittings of the House, but if they are not brought to a conclusion before the expiration of one hour after they have been commenced, Mr. Speaker shall, at the expiration of that time, bring them to a conclusion by putting the Question on the Motion proposed by the Government, after having put the Question, if necessary, on any Amendment or other Motion which has been already proposed from the Chair and not disposed of. After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill. Provided that 5 p.m. shall be substituted for 10.30 p.m., and 2 p.m. for 7.30 p.m. as respects any allotted day which is a Friday, and 3 p.m. shall be substituted for 10.30 p.m. and 12 noon for 7.30 p.m. as respects any allotted day which is a Saturday, as the time at which proceedings are to be brought to a conclusion under the foregoing provisions. A Motion may be made by a Minister of the Crown at the commencement of business on any day that the House sit on the following Saturday at 10 a.m. for the purpose of the consideration of the Bill, and the Question on any Motion so made shall be put forthwith by the Speaker without Amendment or debate. Notice of any Question requiring an oral answer for a Friday or Saturday shall, if that day is an allotted day under this Order, be treated as a notice for the following Monday. For the purpose of bringing to a conclusion any proceedings which are to be brought to a conclusion on an allotted day, and have not previously been brought to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman shall, at the time appointed under this Order for the conclusion of those proceedings, put forthwith the Question on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments, new Clauses, or Schedules moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, Clause, or Schedules, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new Clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be. A Motion may be made by the Government to leave out any Clause or consecutive Clauses of the Bill before the consideration of any Amendments to the Clause or Clauses in Committee. The Question on a Motion made by the Government to leave out any Clause or Clauses of the Bill shall be put forthwith by the Chairman or Speaker without debate. Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order 'Time for taking Private Business,' be taken after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill or under this Order for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. On any day on which any proceedings are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, proceedings for that purpose under this Order shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. On an allotted day no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to re-commit the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Government, and the Question on such Motion shall be put forthwith without any debate. Nothing in this Order shall—(*a*) prevent any business which under this Order is to be concluded on an allotted day being proceeded with on any other day, or necessitate any allotted day or part of an allotted day being given to any such business if the business to be concluded has been otherwise disposed of; or (*b*) prevent any other business being proceeded with on any allotted day or part of an allotted day in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House after the business to be proceeded with or concluded under this Order on the allotted day or part of the allotted day has been disposed of."

TABLE.

Committee Stage.

Allotted Day.	Proceedings.	Time for Proceedings to be brought to a Conclusion.
First - - -	Clause 1 - - - - - -	10.30
Second - - -	Clause 2, and Committee stage of Financial Resolution - - -	10.30
Third - - -	Report stage of Financial Resolution, and Clause 3 - - - -	10.30
Fourth - - -	Clause 4 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clause 5 - - - - - -	10.30
Fifth - - -	Clause 6 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clauses 7, 8, and 9 - - - -	10.30
Sixth - - -	Clauses 10, 11, 12, and new Clauses -	7.30
	Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion - - -	10·30

—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

*MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks): The right hon. Gentleman has made what I am sure is to him an unpalatable statement with all the urbanity and lucidity that we are accustomed to expect from him. He is indeed a past master in the art of persuasion. If it ever falls to my unhappy lot to suffer a severe and drastic surgical operation, there is no one in whom I would have greater confidence or to whom I would rather submit myself than the right hon. Gentleman. He told the House that the proposal is no novelty. It certainly is not. So accustomed are we to this drastic procedure that under ordinary circumstances and with an ordinary Bill we might not have thought it necessary to put the Amendment on the Paper. But the position is not ordinary. The circumstances of the situation clothe the dry bones of this proposition with an aspect which is wholly foreign to the traditions of the House. The right hon. Gentleman does not really fully understand what it is that we complain of in the Resolution he now submits and his treatment or proposed treatment of the remaining stages of the Bill. Let us consider for a moment what the circumstances are. The Bill was introduced less than a week ago, almost surreptitiously ["Oh"] at any rate *sub silentio*, possibly not implying thereby that the Government were ashamed of it, but perhaps implying that they were parting with something they treasured so dearly that they could hardly entrust it to the light of day. Under ordinary circumstances some little interval would have been allowed to elapse between the introduction and the Second Reading of an important measure of this kind. We are allowed two days. Under ordinary circumstances some decent interval would have been allowed between the conclusion of the Second Reading and the commencement of the Committee stage. What is the decent interval allowed now? One day. One Parliamentary day which is occupied by settling the further fate of the Bill. These are not all the circumstances which make our position somewhat singular to-day. The Bill itself is peculiar owing to the fact that it is the outcome of negotiations which have been pursued between the two parties to the long controversy which this Bill proposes to settle. They were negotiations in which we had no opportunity of making ourselves heard at all, and of which we were in ignorance until the very moment the Bill was introduced. It is true that there were various rumours and suggestions in the newspapers from time to time. It is true that those of us, and there are many of us, who are most anxious to take this opportunity of settling this question, watched those negotiations with all the interest of which we were capable, in the hope that some good might proceed from them; but neither we, nor, I think, some of those who actually took part in those negotiations, were quite prepared for the provisions of the Bill as it has been introduced. I think there is reason to believe that the Archbishop himself was somewhat uneasy at the very moment the Bill was introduced. Let us remember that the Archbishop has acted throughout these negotiations on his own responsibility. Let it be remembered that he is head of the English Church. He is in a position of great power. Without his cordial and active co-operation, his future co-operation, it is evident that it is impossible for this Bill to effect a real solution of the difficulty which lies before us. ["Hear, hear."] Yes; if his co-operation with the Government is necessary, our support of him is also necessary. But neither his co operation with you nor our support of him will suffice unless you give us time to discuss this matter with one another. There can be no hope of a lasting settlement unless we can bring into line to co-operate with us, the whole weight of that public opinion, religious and political, which has supported the voluntary school movement for the last thirty years. There is no time under this closure proposal to collect or to focus that opinion. And, if I may say so, it is not only the friends of the Church who are concerned in this matter. I saw, and was happy to see, that at the very moment, or even before this Bill was introduced, a committee was being formed—a committee which has grown with a rapidity which I should say has astonished those who were responsible for its initiation—a committee friendly to a possible settlement, and even that committee were in ignorance of what the Bill really contained. I see in the newspapers of to-day a letter from the Bishop of London about which I will not say more than that it leads me to think at the time he joined this committee he was not familiar with all the provisions which the

Bill contains. There never was a Bill which demanded time so much. Here is a Bill which is designed to reconcile old differences, a Bill which professes to come as a message of conciliation and of peace. You propose to force this measure through the House of Commons as if it was the most hotly debated and contentious Bill with which you have been concerned. What a strange method of conciliation! It is not so much a question of conciliating political opponents as it is a question of conciliating those who aim at the same objects at which you are aiming, and who are willing to support you if they can convince themselves that by supporting you they will effect a real and lasting settlement. It seems to me that it is conciliation not of those who differ from you in their aim, but of those who differ from you in their estimate whether a settlement is likely to be reached. A settlement is only possible if those who set their hands to it do so knowing fully and accurately what it is to which they subscribe. Agreements may be reached, I think often are reached, in private conversation and in correspondence which yet leave loopholes for misunderstanding when the terms which seem so easy to comprehend in private conversation and correspondence find expression in the dry language of Parliamentary draftsmen. It seems to me that that is the kind of situation in which we find ourselves today. If I am right, then I say again that time is essential for an interchange of opinions, which can only find full and accurate expression in an atmosphere which is free from the dust of party politics. I cannot help thinking that hasty and precipitate action on the part of the Government will now go far to wreck the whole scheme which is embodied in their proposals. Speaking for myself, I say that it would be a thousand pities if such a thing were to happen. Never have the two parties been so close together. What a pity it would be if the hands that are now outstretched across the dormant embers of this long and bitter struggle, failed to close in friendly grasp. I think that if failure be the result, the responsibility would rest largely with the Government. We are divided not by the desire of obtaining a settlement, as I said just now; quite the reverse; we are, in fact, divided by our estimate of the chances of a settlement—a settlement, the fabric of which may be erected on the basis of this Bill. Some have hope that a settlement may be arrived at, some apparently have none. I have hope. I still hope, though I confess that the proceedings of the last few days have caused the flame of hope that burned so brightly a week ago, to dwindle down to the merest spark. Hope dies hard. I voted for the Second Reading of the Bill last night because I would not abandon the faint hope that is left to me that Amendments may be made which will convert this Bill into a real treaty of peace, and until I learn from the lips of the Government themselves that they refuse to meet us on points which we consider vital, I shall continue to keep that spark of hope alive. We cannot make peace by merely shifting the scene of hostilities from one part of the field to another. We cannot make a treaty of peace by simply shifting the scene of hostilities from the political platform and the House of Commons, to the election and the council chamber of the local education authority. I say once again that if you really want peace, you must give us time. Why not? The Prime Minister in his opening remarks referred to the fact that we are now coming towards the close of the session. He said unless we are able to carry this Bill through the House of Commons in time for it to go to another place we should arrive at the end of the session, and this Bill would not be carried at all. Yes; we are nearing the end of the session, and as the right hon. Gentleman reminded us yesterday, the session has been full of hard work, and no one knows better than hon. Gentlemen who sit on these benches how hard that work has been. Although we are near the close of this session, we are within measurable distance of the beginning of another session which will begin all too soon. Supposing in the interests of a settlement the Government were to postpone the further consideration of this measure until then, what loss would there be? Can the loss of a few weeks of Parliamentary time weigh against the solution of that problem which has baffled both parties for so long? Is it not worth while to allow of some little delay in the hope of effecting a permanent peace? Why not? Can it be that the Government are afraid of their own supporters who sit behind them? The division of last night should reassure them on that point. Can it be that they are afraid that further consideration would alienate the sympathies of those of us who sit on this side of the House, and who are at present friendly to their proposals? Time and time alone can bring together the whole of the parties who sit here to support the Bill. What time is given? The right hon. Gentleman yesterday referred to the fact that after the twenty years of comparative peace that ensued upon the Act of 1870, we have been engaged during the last twelve or thirteen years in an almost ceaseless conflict upon the education question. The right hon. Gentleman proposes to end the struggle that has been going on for twelve years by forcing through this Bill in twelve days. Twelve Parliamentary days are sufficient, in his view, to close in peace a struggle which has lasted twelve years. The proposal is almost grotesque. I think the right hon. Gentleman would have recognised how grotesque it is if his finer feelings were not blunted by the constant and incessant use of the weapon which he now employs. It has become a part of the settled system of this Government to subject each of their important proposals to a Resolution of this character. Some Resolutions seem to be a little more drastic than others; some of them seem to be a little longer than others, but the process is always invariably the same, and the object is to stifle debate in the present House of Commons. It has become their stereotyped method of conducting business. Let me remind the House that this is the growth of only three years. Any Member who has sat in Parliaments previous to this one must know that this method of closure was only employed when it became perfectly evident that there was grave and insuperable obstruction on the part of those in opposition.

MR. ASQUITH: What I said was that it was a very bad plan to wait for obstruction and then to introduce a Resolution.

*MR. FORSTER: The right hon. Gentleman does not quarrel with my original proposition that this method of conducting business has grown up in the last three years, and this is the stereotyped method by which the Government intend to carry on their business. They are supported by the greatest majority of modern times. They are faced by the weakest Opposition numerically that the House has seen for generations.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the House of Lords?

*MR. FORSTER: I did not know the right hon. Gentleman was able to pass any Resolution of this kind in this House which was able to stifle the debate in the House of Lords. But while the right hon. Gentleman has stereotyped this method of preventing full discussion, the Government have invariably allowed some decent interval—some breathing space, between the Second Reading and the Committee stage, and here we have that small right, which we have come to regard as our own, taken from us. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington claimed that in this matter private Members ought to have the right of full freedom of debate. The right hon. Gentleman speaks with that freedom from restraint which is probably less refreshing to his former colleagues, than it evidently is to himself. At any rate, I can claim the sympathy and respect of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington, and I trust before the debate closes he will give full expression to his passionate desire for full and unfettered freedom of debate. I know quite well no representations that we can make, however earnest and sincere, will avail with the Government for a single moment. They have made up their minds. They intend to force this Bill through the House of Commons, and I am afraid—I speak with honest disappointment—nothing I can say will move them to change their course. Let us look the facts full in the face and see where it is that we are going, if we persist in conducting business in this fashion. It is but a step from the present method to a plan by which some future Government may introduce a Resolution of this kind allocating the whole time of the session to measures which they intend to lay before it. That is a danger which we need not apprehend from the present Government, because they change their plans and their policy so constantly that it would be a method of conducting business which would obviously not be agreeable to them. But some future Government may adopt such a plan, and if and when they do, those hon. Gentlemen opposite, who will then have an opportunity of considering such a proposal, will find that their acquiescence and support of the drastic and violent methods of the Government will render their future protestations completely ineffectual. By the action that they take now they will shut themselves off from the opportunity of making full and effective protest in Parliaments to come. I really would ask the Government to reconsider this matter before it is too late. If they are sincere, and we believe them to be sincere, in the efforts they are making to still the clamour that has rung in our ears for the last ten or twelve years; if they are anxious, as we are, to end this long and bitter struggle; if they want to secure the co-operation of that great volume of common sense which can only make itself heard when party strife is silent, I would ask them to give the House and the country time to think. The Government has a great and golden opportunity, and if by hasty and precipitate action they waste it, the responsibility for their failure will be theirs alone.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after 'That,' and to add the words 'this House, being of opinion that a settlement of the education question by general agreement is urgently required, and that such agreement can only be secured if the views of all parties interested are fully discussed by this House, regrets that exceptional means of curtailing debate should be used to force precipitately through its remaining stages a measure touching complicated interests and rousing vehement feelings.' "—(*Mr. Forster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the Committee stage, Report stage,' stand part of the Resolution.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.) said he wished to say with as little acerbity or violence as possible that the Catholic body demanded, particularly under the special circumstances, a full discussion of the clauses as they affected them. He neither affirmed nor denied the necessity in general of longer discussions than the Government had granted, but he advised it on that particular point. If there was one thing in the Bill in regard to which 2,000,000 people were asking what the issue would be without any reference to whether they voted Liberal or Conservative, it was that part which related to the Roman Catholic schools. The Catholic body was united in protesting against certain elements contained in the Bill, but it was not yet united with regard to the alternative proposals which it desired to make. How would it be possible within the limits of one day to debate that vital subject? It could not be debated. He had just come from a Catholic meeting at Liverpool, where he had seen a quarter of the population of the town, and feeling on this subject was more intense there than on any other subject of political thought. They were, if the House could conceive such a thing, feeling it more than they would feel the fall of Consols which would occur when the first Tariff Commission sat. They were feeling it more than they would feel some physical disaster, or loss of employment and wages. He regretted his attitude should be in opposition to the point of view of the Government. He recognised that the Bill must go through soon, and he recognised that this was an attempt for the greater part of the population at a compromise. He sympathised with that attempt, but the Catholics demanded fuller discussion of the clauses affecting them than they would get under the Government Resolution.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): If I take the rather unusual course of rising so soon after my hon. friend, with every word of whose speech I am in sympathy, it is because I have had no opportunity of saying a word on this Bill. I take the very deepest interest in it, and unless I rise now I should be prevented from making any appeal to the Government. It is the misfortune of many of us during an autumn session, a misfortune which has a bearing on the question which we are now discussing, that that is the time which is usually devoted by hon. Members to meeting the electorate, and many of us have engagements, made a long time ago, concerning a great number of other people, which we are unable to break, and which themselves limit our opportunities of taking part in the discussions. In a short time I have to leave the House to fulfil one of those engagements, and that is the reason I speak now. I think I occupy in some respects a rather peculiar position in reference to this education question. I was brought up as a Nonconformist in the midst of Nonconformist surroundings. I remain a member of the body in which I was born, and I think from those associations I have perhaps a greater appreciation of the point of view of Nonconformists and perhaps a greater kindness for them which cannot always be shared by those who have not my opportunities of knowing them intimately and well. On the other hand, my present associations for a long time have brought me into close touch with Churchmen. I can appreciate their views even where I do not share them. I am not one of the militant section of Nonconformists which thinks the great aims of Nonconformity can only be prosecuted at the expense of the Established Church. I am therefore from this middle position earnestly and anxiously desirous of finding some common ground of agreement on a controversy which has lasted so long and which has had such deplorable results for all the great interests which are involved. That being my position I voted for the Second Reading of the Bill last night and hope to be able to vote for the Third Reading. It would not be reasonable to ask a pledge of any man at this stage, but I desire to support the Bill through all its stages, and I believe there is still an opportunity to find, within the principles which it lays down and without calling upon either of the parties to the dispute for any sacrifice of their principles, an enduring settlement of this long-standing and bitter controversy. That, I know, is the object of the Government, but that is a tremendous undertaking. The Government have introduced into this House many large measures, but this is by far the biggest thing the Government have yet attempted. To produce a one-sided solution of this or of any question is a comparatively easy matter. To produce a solution which shall secure so great a body of agreement on all sides as to render it an enduring settlement is the heaviest, the most difficult task that any Government could undertake. It is the most responsible task upon which this House can employ its energies. If that be so, surely when we think we see an agreement within the bounds of possibility it is folly to abandon any chance of success or to do anything which lessens the prospects of a satisfactory result. On what does the chance of our providing a permanent settlement depend? It depends not on the views of extremists on one side or the other, but upon the extent to which we are successful—I use the word "we" because we are anxious to co-operate with the Government in the matter—in securing the great body of moderate opinion which lies between these two extremes. It depends upon whether, when the Bill passes, it has the support of a sufficiently large body of central opinion, and whether it is launched with the prospect that that body of central opinion will tend to grow and the body of extremist opinion to diminish. The right hon. Gentleman alluded to the settlement which was secured for so many years by the Act of 1870. I have lived among those who took a very active part in that controversy, who were not at all satisfied with the solution which was reached, but who nevertheless submitted to it, and by doing their best to work it, made it the success it has been for so long. But does the right hon. Gentleman think that that result would have been secured if those who objected to the settlement of 1870, whether they were Nonconformists or Churchmen, had not felt that their case had been fully laid before Parliament, and their views fully discussed, and that if at the end Parliament decided against them, at any rate Parliament had given the fullest consideration to that which they had to urge? I do not see how we can hope to gather in that great body of moderate public opinion which I think it is still within possibility that we may secure for the settlement of this question, unless every man feels that his case has been fairly heard, and that this great tribunal of the nation has not stopped the case while important arguments which he wished to urge were unheard. I feel this so strongly—I feel that upon the resolution which the Government takes now depends so largely the prospects of the future success of their measure—that I most earnestly beg them to reconsider the attitude which they have taken up. I do not say this in criticism or in blame of the Government, who, I understand, have been in a position of extraordinary difficulty, but I think we see already the danger and the evil of too great haste. The Government—the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education—entered into negotiations with the Archbishop and the Bishops on the one hand, and the Nonconformists on the other. They brought them within measurable distance of one another. That is common ground. I wish they had given a little more time to bridge, by way of negotiation, the small gulf that still divides them. In order to put the House in possession of their views at the earliest possible moment, in order to get on with the Bill, they produced it before the negotiations were complete, and I cannot but feel from what we have seen since, and the divergences of opinion now disclosed amongst the negotiators themselves as to the result of their negotiations, that the few days gained by presenting the Bill before the negotiations were complete were so many days actually lost in the prospect of the settlement of the question. I am anxious that that mistake, made with the best intentions, should not be repeated while the Bill is on its passage through the House. What is it that we desire — I should hope every man in the House, whatever his view as to the provisions of the Bill, and still more those of us who think we see in it a possible solution. We desire that the greatest possible number of schools should come within the system, that there should be the smallest number of schools desiring to take advantage of the provisions which relate to contracting-out. For the educational success of the measure apart from its religious side it is of the utmost importance that the scheme which the Government designate the normal national scheme, should embrace as many of the schools of the country as possible. Is time wasted that is spent in assuring, by discussion, by consideration, by Amendment if necessary, those whom you invited into your scheme that when they come into it they should be certain of fair treatment? Surely no time that we ask for in reason, in order to satisfy those whom we wish to rally to the support of the solution, will be wasted if it helps to bring in more people voluntarily and gladly to accept the provisions of the Bill, and to convince them that what the Government have expressed to be their intentions will in fact be the result of their measure. On the other hand, we all have to recognise, whatever personal view we take, that you cannot bring into the national system as contemplated by the Government all the schools of the country—that the Roman Catholic schools, that a certain section of the Church schools and possibly some other denominational schools, will have to stand outside that system. You are asking those whom you put outside the normal national system to make a great sacrifice. You are asking them to give up their share in what you declare to be the national education of the nation to which they belong and of which they are as loyal and patriotic citizens as any others. Is not a little time well spent in trying to reconcile them to their position, in trying to meet their difficulties, and in assuring them that at any rate the House of Commons is willing to listen to all they have to say, anxious if it can to make their position more tolerable and less burdensome? You cannot deal with matters like these in a single afternoon. We do not know until we begin to discuss the Bill what shades of opinion will develop—what points will be raised. All we know is that we have entered on the most difficult task that any House of Commons can set itself, that upon the skill, the patience, the consideration which we give to this measure, and which we show in our relations to one another, depends our prospect of success, and under these circumstances, to ask us to be tied down to a few short days, at a time of year when it is exceedingly difficult for any of us to promise constant day to day attendance in consequence of our other public engagements, when many of us would probably get no opportunity of speaking, particularly those who represent the middle and central opinion, because it would be the extremists who would claim, and reasonably, the first right to be heard, on either side, and it will be the moderate men, who are most desirous of finding in the Bill a settlement, who will be crowded out—if you do that you handicap yourselves so heavily at the start that with all our anxious desire to find a settlement in the Bill, I should almost despair of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. The House I hope will recognise the depth of my conviction and the earnestness of my wish for a settlement, and I most anxiously beg the Prime Minister to give the House latitude on this, because I believe it is only by allowing them latitude that a settlement can be arrived at. Much as I dislike autumn sessions, much as I dislike sessions which are carried over Christmas, bad as I know it to be for Parliament, and bad as it is for each one of us, I will grudge no labour that the Government exacts from us in order that we may have full time to discuss this measure. I will support them, if they think it necessary to adjourn over Christmas, I would try to meet them in whatever way of that kind they like, but I believe time is essential to a satisfactory solution, and if you do not give us time this great opportunity will be lost, and to lose the opportunity now that we have come so near to an agreement would be a calamity we should all regret for the rest of our lives.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) joined in the appeals made from the front Opposition bench to the Government to reconsider this measure of closure. He had not yet made up his mind whether to go into the division lobby. He certainly did not like the wording of the Amendment. It did not express his feelings in opposition to the scheme which had been proposed. He wanted to ask the Government if it were quite impossible to add two extra days to this closure scheme. If they could add two days they would receive a great amount of willing support, which would now be given unwillingly, and a great amount of support which would not be given at all if they forced the scheme through in its present form.

MR. ASQUITH: Does the hon. Gentleman mean two days to the Committee stage?

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD replied that he did. Some of them had hoped to put down Amendments to that effect, but owing to the severe pressure and to having work outside, many of them had been absolutely prevented from putting down any Amendments. He suggested that the time allotted to Clauses 1 and 2 and to the section including the Schedules was altogether inadequate. Another half day to Clause 1, another half day to Clause 2, and another day devoted to the Schedules, so far as he was concerned, would at any rate make the scheme of closure much more acceptable. He quite agreed with the position taken up by the Government fundamentally. The Bill was open to improvement. He opposed the Bill in some of its essential characteristics, but he was not going to press it in a factious way. He quite admitted that after due discussion and adequate consideration the Government were entitled to ask the House to pass the Bill. He also agreed that it was very much better to let the House now consider what the scheme of closure was going to be, rather than wait two or three days and then in a hurry and after perhaps inadequate consideration produce the scheme. He could not admit for a single moment from the constitutional point of view that the Government had any business to come to the House and say "We have arranged certain terms with outside parties, and you have to take these terms or reject them." As the representative of a constituency he could not recognise that doctrine. He might be wrong, but that was how the position of the Government struck him at the present time. They were told that there was no use discussing certain terms of this Bill. He was sorry to hear the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday that the only question which the House had to consider was whether the Bill would effect peace. It all depended on what was meant by peace. Whether the Bill was going to effect peace was a matter to be determined by the terms of peace which it contained, and therefore the House must insist upon, and the Government must give, an opportunity for discussing the terms of peace as well as the desirability or the efficacy of peace itself. The Prime Minister had said that there was nothing novel in the Bill. Practically everything in the Bill was novel. The fundamental novelty of the Bill was the position of the Government. He was perfectly certain that the Government had a very good reason for changing their opinion, but he did not know what the reason was. He was strongly opposed to the change, according to his present lights. The table indicating the time to be allotted to the Committee stage showed that Clause 2 with reference to the right of entry was to be dealt with in one day. He submitted that one day was not sufficient even to give adequate explanations of the clause. Even extremists—he did not object to that term being applied to himself in this matter—approached this question with the idea of having an adequate chance of putting their views before the House, of having them examined and discussed, and, more particularly, of having a statement from the Government why they had changed so fundamentally the position they had taken up during the last two years of the controversy. Clause 1 was to be dealt with in one day. First of all they must make up their minds as to whether the wording of subsection (*a*) was at all adequate to carry out what was intended. Then subsection (*b*) was a novel rendering of the Cowper-Temple clause. It changed its basis fundamentally and in such a way as surely to necessitate adequate discussion. Then there was the question whether fees should be imposed or not. He did not think the wording of the third subsection of the clause would effectively secure free places to all children who desired them. Surely the Government would admit that these four points were important and ought to be adequately discussed. At any rate, three of them were major points, and even if the House approached them without any intention of discussing them fundamentally and on principle, but simply for the purpose of finding out what the position of the Government was, whether they were essential to the compromise, and what their exact meaning was—surely the time allotted to them was not adequate for the purpose. The House should surely have an opportunity of discussing a Motion to delete Clause 2 in order that the principle embodied in the clause might be adequately explained. There was the question as to the time to be given to religious instruction, there was also the question of the position of the teachers, both headmasters and assistants, in regard to the giving of religious instruction. The financial provisions embodied in the fourth subsection of the clause seemed exceedingly pettifogging, but the Government had no doubt some good reason for what was proposed. Subsections 5 and 6 also involved important details. It was proposed that all those matters should be discussed in the short space of six hours. He was not going to approach this matter in an irreconcilable manner. He voted against the Second Reading of the Bill with a large amount of regret. If, as the result of the discussions in Committee, he could bring himself to vote for the Third Reading, he would be only too glad to do so. That was conditional on fair and adequate discussion, and he did not think that was provided for in the scheme of closure now before the House.

Mr. ASQUITH: I rise now merely out of courtesy to the right hon. Gentleman opposite and my hon. friend who has just sat down. I listened with very great sympathy to the appeal made to me both by the hon. Member for Sevenoaks, who in an admirable speech moved the Amendment, and by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Worcestershire, because I know that both are genuine friends of a settlement of this matter. I am not quite so sure of the hon. Member for Leicester. He put forward certain Parliamentary considerations which are perfectly fair matters for discussion. As I have said, it is with great reluctance I make the Motion and I only make it in this form because it is the only chance of getting the Bill through on this side of Christmas, which I believe is generally desired. But I would make this suggestion in response to the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman. If it will facilitate progress, I propose—it is a very great sacrifice of Government time, but I am prepared to face it—to add two days to the Committee stage, thus giving eight instead of six. The effect of that will be to postpone from Saturday till Tuesday week the day on which the Schedules would be taken. That is rather important, because I am satisfied it will turn out the more this matter is discussed in Committee that the really open point, upon which the success of the chances of a settlement mainly depends, is as to the terms on which contracting-out is to be allowed. [AN HON. MEMBER: "What about Clause 2?"] As regards Clause 2, I do not think we will have much trouble. If anybody can show that the right of entry is not sufficiently safeguarded, I am quite prepared to put in language that will make it abundantly clear. It is merely a point of draftmanship; the intention is absolutely clear. But as regards the scale of grants to contracted-out schools, and to some extent the rent or other consideration to be paid to transferred schools, there is at this moment—I speak frankly—an outstanding difference. I do not pretend to say that we absolutely see eye to eye on these points, but I have the strongest hope that these differences will be composed and a settlement arrived at. There is, however, solid ground for what the right hon. Gentleman said that that matter should be kept open as long as possible in order that the various persons concerned should have an opportunity of inter-communication and negotiation. They understand the point, and I am pretty sure that in the course of the next seven or eight days, after the discussions in the House and outside, they will be better able to come to an understanding; but it is desirable to put off as long as we can the necessity of coming to a final decision. If that proposal meets with general acceptance, if it eases the situation in the view of those who are genuinely anxious that the Bill should go through, I shall be prepared to make modifications in the Resolution, which will extend the Committee stage from six to eight days, and which will provide for that additional discussion, certainly upon Clause 2, and upon the financial parts, and particularly the Schedules, which, I think, in the opinion of the House and of those who desire a settlement, are the parts to which Committee discussion might be most profitably directed.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) asked what the right hon. Gentleman proposed to do in regard to Clause 2.

MR. ASQUITH: I propose to extend the time for Clause 2. At present it is confined to one day in the Committee stage. I propose to give another half-day at any rate. If the hon. Gentleman will wait a moment, we will have the exact details put before the House.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) asked whether some better opportunity would be given for the discussion of the new clauses. Under the present table the new clauses would be absolutely ruled out.

MR. ASQUITH: If we take the Schedules and the new clauses, and give them a day to themselves, the new clauses will have a better opportunity of being discussed.

MR. DILLON: Will the new clauses come after the Schedules?

MR. ASQUITH: No, before.

MR. DILLON: If the new clauses come after Clauses 10, 11, and 12 on the same day as proposed in the table, the new clauses will have no chance whatever of being discussed. Could not the new clauses be taken at the beginning of the day on which the Schedules are taken?

MR. ASQUITH: If the new clauses are taken on the same day as Clauses 10, 11, and 12, we can divide the day in half.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford), said the announcement made by the Prime Minister met to some extent the views of hon. Members. He urged that in re-arranging the time-table provision should be made to ensure some opportunity of discussing the third clause of the Bill. At present it was proposed to take it on the third day after the financial Resolution. If Clause 2 took a day and a half, it was possible that discussion on Clause 3 might be squeezed out altogether. He would most earnestly appeal to the right hon. Gentleman, notwithstanding the solid concession which he had made, still further to consider the view put forward by his hon. friend on the front bench. Personally, he was just as much as the right hon. Gentleman in favour of arriving at once at some compromise on this question. If he had been in the House the previous evening, as unfortunately he was not, he would have voted in favour of the Second Reading of the Bill, because he believed that the principles in it were founded on the only possible settlement of the question. But it seemed to him that the guillotine and a Bill to be taken by consent of the House were incompatable. It had been almost impossible during the Second Reading debate to get beyond the different matters dealt with in the various clauses. He agreed with the Prime Minister that they did not want so much these Second Reading discussions in Committee, but they could not avoid it. What was wanted was discussion in detail in order to discover how far the clauses of the Bill, as presented to the House, would carry out the understanding or any desire which they had for the purpose of bringing about peace. It did not seem to him that even with the concession which had been made, the House was likely to obtain the opportunity for a detailed discussion of all the points which might be hereafter arranged. Certainly, as far as the Schedules were concerned, they were assured that they were to have further time; but it must be remembered, and nobody knew it better than the Government, that when these negotiations were spoken of as concluded, they were not concluded. The Archbishop of Canterbury, so far as he was acting for the Church of England, was never satisfied with regard to the financial provisions, more especially on the question of contracting out and rent. Then there was the difficult question of expenditure during the last few years, which was in no way dealt with in the two Schedules, and which would have to be dealt with before the Bill became law. It was because he felt strongly that the hopes of peace were being shattered by the Bill being conducted under the guillotine that he urged the Government to give further time for the consideration of the points to which he had referred. It had been hinted that the hurried discussions of these clauses were to be taken not only in the Parliamentary time of next week, but were to be continued into the Saturday, when it would be impossible for all Members to be present. It seemed to him that there was every reason to ask the Government to hestitate before they laid this new stumbling stone on procedure. Hitherto, closure procedure had always been confined to controversial measures. But the Government put forward this Bill as a measure of compromise and concession, to be passed by consent, but with the knowledge that there would be outside opposition to it; and it seemed to him that to introduce into the procedure of the House this controversial method acting in regard to this Bill, was not only to introduce a new and dangerous precedent, but was likely to shatter the hopes of the Government and himself, that they had at last found a settlement of this extremely difficult question. The earliest date upon which it would be possible for the views of the Representative Council of the Church of England as a whole to be heard was 3rd December, when that council would meet; but by that date the Blll would be more than half-way through the Committee stage. That was the earliest meeting at which the opinion of the Church of England as a whole could be voiced, and yet they were asked to pass the first three clauses of the Bill before that date. The whole matter had been hurried on in order, apparently, that the House might adjourn before Christmas. That, however, was only a matter of the convenience of the followers of the Government and of Ministers. It was not a matter which affected a question that went to the root of the most difficult problem ever brought before Parliament. Surely time should be given for consideration, in order that, if possible, they might round off all the difficulties surrounding the situation felt by different sections of the religious life of the community. They could not effect a settlement unless the Roman Catholic Church was satisfied. The Government had allowed that in the negotiations they gave too little time to that particular part of the problem, and surely that was a proof of the necessity of giving more time in order that the House might deal in Committee with those questions which would have to be dealt with before a final settlement was attained. He believed that the only chance of obtaining the consent of all sections of the community and of smoothing out all the points of difficulty so as to reach a settlement which would be acceptable on all hands, would be to give a little more time for the fair consideration of the details of the measure. He appealed to the Government, with no party motive, but in their own interest, to give further consideration to the plea put forward by the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment.

Mr. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said he would be inclined to ask the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken whether he believed that there was any other course of procedure than that proposed by the Government by which this Bill could be passed during the present session in view of the exhibition of hostility with which it had been received in certain quarters. He did not mean party quarters.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY said that if the hon. Member appealed to him he thought it would be quite possible to have a limited period after there had been time to consider whether the present difficulties could be smoothed over and rounded off.

Mr. J. W. WILSON said he was going to suggest that there might be another alternative. Before the system of closure by compartments was adopted, the suspension of the eleven o'clock or the twelve o'clock rule was resorted to. During his experience of the House, which extended through three Parliaments, he could not put his finger on any Bill which had been opposed by any substantial section of the House which had been got through without a measure of closure by compartments. As far as he could remember the late Sir W. Harcourt's great Budget dealing with the death duties had passed through without the closure; and why? It was because, in his opinion, it was not subject to the twelve o'clock rule by the nature of the case. Since then, he repeated, there had no first class measures passed by either party in the House without the use of the closure by compartments.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): During the ten years from 1895 to 1905, only three guillotine Motions were proposed, and I presume that in these years some important, some principal measures were passed.

MR. J. W. WILSON: There were not many principal measures in those years. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh."] Well, there was a great measure of Compensation in 1897, but that was in no sense controversial.

SIR F. BANBURY: And this measure is not controversial.

MR. J. W. WILSON said he would grant that it might not be controversial between the two front benches, but nobody could deny that there were strong minority sections in the House who felt conscientiously obliged to oppose it. Therefore he must contend that it should rank as one of the controversial measures brought before Parliament. However, what he rose for was to appeal to hon. Members on both sides of the House, not only to the Leaders who sat on the front benches, but particularly to the Leaders who sat on the back benches, to exercise their influence to pass a Bill which, to a large extent, had been brought in by consent, this session, even with the assistance of closure by guillotine. Anyone who looked back on the action of the closure by guillotine during the last few years, whether it was the Licensing Bill, which had just left the House, or the Licensing Bill of 1904, or the Education Bill of 1902, or the Education Bill of 1906, could see that the opportunities afforded for discussion by the House had not been made proper use of by either party. Whatever party was in Opposition had felt it incumbent on them to show how easily they could waste the time of the House. In his opinion that was a degradation of debate and the procedure of the House, and he appealed to Members on both sides, whether on this Bill, or measures like it, they should not make the most of their debating power, instead of indulging, as had recently been the case, in increasing discursiveness which turned out not better but worse legislation. The result was that either another place was invited to throw the Bill out, or it was not so creditable and workmanlike a piece of legislation as many of them, quite apart from party or temporary motives, would like to feel that the House was capable of turning out. Therefore, he appealed to the House that whatever system of compartments was decided upon—and he was glad to hear that the Prime Minister had indicated some extension of the compartments on the Paper—or whether the House determined to suspend the eleven o'clock rule occasionally for the sake of extending the debate on most important subjects, they should try to make the best of their Parliamentary machinery and not the worst of it.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) hoped he might be allowed to say a few words as he had not intervened in the debate hitherto. He had not had the honour of taking part in the former negotiations which it appeared had taken place, but he had taken a most active and energetic part in inducing his friends of the Church of England, in various assemblies and in private society, to uphold what some persons called the compromise, but what he preferred to designate by the less invidious term of the agreement. He also voted for the Second Reading of this Bill the evening before, and he was gratified that many of his hon. associates on that side of the House were to be found in the same lobby. It would be a great disappointment to them if the Bill did not become law. He did not say the Bill as it now stood, but he trusted it would be altered in the course of their discussion. There was, however, much to be said in favour of delay. The first argument that he thought an important one in a constitutional country was that from precedent. The custom of Parliament and of this House had never been to hurry forward measures contrary to the wishes and sentiments of those who desired to criticise and oppose, and when they looked beyond the shores of this country to foreign countries they found that in regard to those revolutionary periods when legislation or enactment, not of the character of legislation, were carried through in haste and with precipitation, those decisions had never become permanent, but were doomed to death from the day on which they became the law of those unfortunate countries. He would greatly regret if there was a tendency in that direction in this country, but he feared that there were symptoms of it, and he believed that if that movement was extended much further, it would bring great evils to this country, and it was quite possible that it might impair the authority even of this ancient, most venerable and honourable Assembly. When Prince Albert came to this country he made a remarkable observation—showing an acute mind—which was much challenged at the time. He said the institutions of this country—his adopted country—were on their trial; and his opinion was that if these modes of procedure were carried out, it might fairly be said that the House of Commons was on its trial. He was perfectly sure that whatever might be the votes of Parliament passed in this precipitate and hasty way, the authority of Parliament would be weakened by that mode of action and the representative institution damaged. He ventured to say that this haste and rapidity of movement was inconsistent with that confidence and intercourse which ought to exist between Members of the House themselves and between Members and their constituents. The relations of Members and their constituents ought to continue as they had been for generations, and they necessarily must do so if those relations were to be of a satisfactory, and, he might say, constitutional character. Then they came to the present situation. What was it? There had been great hopes of an agreement. He had shared in those hopes and they were not extinguished now, but he believed that all persons who had experience in negotiations would agree with him when he said that when there were acute differences and opposition, and possibly heated feeling on one side or the other, still more when those conditions occurred on both sides, the real healer of these differences was not so much argument as time and patience and deliberation. It was wonderful, if both parties desired to come together, if one gave them an opportunity for deliberation and allowed their feelings to cool down, how in the course of a short time an agreement, apparently hopeless, became accomplished and became a reality. He believed there never was a time when the condition of educational affairs showed more improvement than on the present occasion. They had passed from a period of heat to a time when there was a prospect of agreement. At the present moment there were some grits in the machinery, and there was friction and impediment. What they wanted was, in his opinion, an opportunity of removing that friction and putting an end to those conditions. He asked that they should have an opportunity of so doing and taking some step, at any rate, to secure the solution of these difficult problems. According to the old saying of an experienced draftsman, as Lord Thring said to him time after time, the real plan was to make the first clause their Bill. The first clause had been the Bill in regard to these measures. It was the case with the Bill of the present Chief Secretary, and the Bill of the First Lord of the Admiralty, and with this Bill. He thought if they examined this Bill and read the first clause, they found there was considerable difficulty in making such alterations as would make it consistent with the real feelings and wishes of hon. Members on that side, and also of the Roman Catholics and other sections of the House. He himself was bound to have some regard to the feelings of the Roman Catholics, because, although he did not possess the confidence of the Irish Roman Catholics in the borough of Wigan, he did possess the confidence of the English Roman Catholics, in saying a word for them on this occasion. He doubted whether the Government had really fully appreciated the vast importance of their own Bill. They desired, and he shared their desire, that this should be the occasion of a settlement, but except they had full appreciation of the difficulties of the situation, except they fully understood the enormous magnitude of the issues depending upon their deliberations, and if in forgetfulness or ignorance they were driven to rash and hasty and precipitate conclusions, they might depend upon it that the settlement would not be of a permanent character. It would be condemned to destruction from the very day when the new statute became law. Controversies would not cease and all feelings would not abate, but they would have from the moment the Bill was placed upon the Statute-book, new antagonisms, new controversies, and new bitternesses, and they would find themselves not nearer to an ultimate settlement, but much further from that happy conclusion than they were at present.

MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) said he felt very strongly both the appeal of the hon. Member for the Sevenoaks division of Kent and of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire, and was sure that with himself many hon. Members on that side of the House regretted that it was not possible to give more time to the discussion of many important details which arose on the Bill. In regard to what the hon. Member had just said he would only say that delay sometimes gave opportunities for faction as well as for promoting conciliation. If, however, they found that any further extension of time was really likely to bring about a settlemen he was sure that many hon. Members would not allow personal considerations in regard to the assembling of Parliament to stand in the way. He wanted on another point to make an appeal to the Government. As the time-table stood in the White Paper it appeared that Clauses 10, 11, and 12, and the new clauses, were to be disposed of in half a day, and as adumbrated in the Resolution before the House that half a day would be next Saturday, so that all these would have to be disposed of in a short time. The Prime Minister had indicated his willingness to meet an appeal with regard to the new clauses, but he would like to put in a word as to the extreme importance of there being some appreciable time for discussing Clause 10. This was the only clause which dealt with financial supervision other than those which dealt with the contracting-out schools. A considerable number of persons, although interested in the religious controversy, were yet sufficiently mundane to realise that a great deal depended upon the financial provision made for local authority schools. The provisions of the Bill which he cordially supported, would involve greater expenditure upon local authorities, and they had no provisions in the Bill, but were referred instead to financial provisions which his right hon. friend the First Lord of the Admiralty issued as long ago as last spring. It was only on Clause 10 that the financial question could be raised, and they attached supreme importance to obtaining certain modifications and were anxious when this clause came up for discussion to put before the House and the Government as practical administrators of the Act their case for the modification they asked and the financial provisions as a whole. He therefore, appealed to the President of the Board of Education to secure that in the enlarged time-table there was at least half one Parliamentary day given to Clauses 10, 11 and 12. Clauses 11 and 12 were comparatively unimportant, but Clause 10 was a clause of great importance.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has treated this question as if an extra half a day one way or the other will settle the question. But the matter is far too serious for anything of that sort, and therefore, although an extra half day will give room for half a day's extra speaking, we are in this strange position—a position such as in thirty years Parliamentary experience I have never known. It is a constitutional question which we are discussing. For 700 years this House has gone on. Its first object often has not been legislation, but to require for the Commons of this country full, free, and unfettered discussion. There has always been free, full, and unfettered discussion up to the last three years or so. So jealous has Parliament been of this privilege that it has refused to deal with the abuse of it, refused to deal with limitations or anything that has even a chance of limiting our discussions. It has been always held that it is better to put up with the abuses than to do anything that would impair the right of discussion itself. For the past three years that has been altered. Instead of legislating by discussion we have legislated by the machinery of closure and the guillotine. It is said that that existed before three years ago, but before three years ago the closure and guillotine were rare incidents in our discussions, used as a last resource to put an end to obstruction and undue opposition. Now it has become the rule. Why do not the Government meet Parliament with a programme, and say: "We in the Cabinet have decided what is to be passed, and we will take each of the measures without any discussion at all, and pass them into law, so far as this House is concerned, by the closure." That would be legislation by the Cabinet. The result would be practically the same as this smothering of discussion. There will, however, be no time saved. The right hon. Gentleman has brought forward this measure after settling and arranging with certain parties outside, one of whom, the Archbishop, is non-representative of the people. But did the right hon. Gentleman consult hon. Members who sat in Opposition and in other parts of the House, who represent large constituencies whose interests are to be dealt with in the manner proposed by the Bill? I believe not. They are to be faced with the preconcerted plan settled by arrangements with others outside. These arrangements are not completed, and from that point of view the Bill itself is introduced prematurely, and so we had this enormous question forced through its Second Reading with what I might call a burlesque of discussion—a proceeding which it was a farce to call a discussion. Now it is proposed to pass it through its Committee stage, and having regard to the number of points, clauses and questions which have to be settled, with practically no discussion at all. I do not value the two extra days that have been given in order that there might be a little more discussion. Judging by what is due to the country and to the House, and judging by the traditions of this House, I say that to talk about eight days for the Committee stage of this Bill is an insult to the Constitution and to the constituencies of the country, and instead of this Bill achieving the peace which we are told it will, it will bring war. We should have had time to thrash out this question thoroughly in Committee—not taking eight days, but such time as was necessary thoroughly to thrash it out—there might then have been some prospect of a settlement. But though we may be denied the opportunity of thrashing it out here, no one can prevent the question being well discussed in the country, and that is what will be done. If the Government force this Bill through without debate here, then the discussion will be taken up in the constituencies and then it will be too late. There is another important view which I would like to bring to the notice of my right hon. friend opposite and of the House. That which has distinguished this House of Commons and honourably distinguished its proceedings from the proceedings of every other legislative assembly in the world is that in this country there has always been continuity of legislation. What is passed by one Government is not upset by another, although that other Government may have been of different complexion. That continuity of legislation is due to the fact that hitherto every important measure that has been passed in this House has been thoroughly discussed to its extreme limits and was the deliberate outcome of prolonged discussion and argument, and, once settled, it was settled for ever. That continuity has been destroyed by the action of the Government in forcing legislation through this House by means not of discussion but of machinery. It is a fact that you are destroying this great constitutional practice and this most beneficent result of full, free, and unfettered discussion. I am not going to discuss the rights or wrongs of the various demands of the different sections in the House, either of the Church, Roman Catholics, or Nonconformists. Their demands may be right or they may be wrong, but in any case they have a right to place them before the House and to discuss them to their fullest extent. I am not personally concerned in the claims of the various churches, but I will take this opportunity of saying that I and many others have good cause to be thankful for the action of the churches before 1870, without which many of us would have had no education at all. When we talk of these matters and of the work done for our fathers and forefathers, I would ask hon. Gentlemen representing the Labour Party where they would have been but for the voluntary schools, which opened their doors for the education of the poor? Why should you destroy those voluntary schools without letting them have a full chance of pleading their cause, and giving them full recognition of the debt of gratitude which is due to them as institutions which were the means of education to the poor at a time when there was no other provision for them? The Prime Minister has agreed to give other two days, but if you give other four, six, or any number of days, I for one shall not be satisfied with anything less than a full discussion of every grievance from whatever quarter it comes, in connection with this Bill. Those who call themselves democrats and claim to represent Labour, when they join in a vote which disposes of the liberties of the people as represented in this House, do not in reality represent the real democracy. This country is imbued with a love of full and free discussion, whether inside or outside of the House, and it will resent any attempt to interfere with it, especially in an assembly where free discussion has always been regarded as the greatest privilege and the greatest safeguard of the liberties of the people. My hon. friend the Member for Worcestershire who spoke just now advanced a plea. What was it? What was his reason for voting for this curtailment of free discussion? He said it was the only way to silence the minority. That was the keynote of his speech.

Mr. J. W. WILSON said that what he had contended was that the only way open to them was either to apply the closure or suspend the eleven o'clock rule and sit on. But many objected to sitting into late hours, though personally he was quite ready to sit up all night instead of having the closure.

*Mr. JESSE COLLINGS: I misunderstood the position of the hon. Gentleman. I thought his position was that the only way to deal with the matter was to silence the majority. In that it appears I was mistaken. But I want to add another reason in support of the claim that we ought to have a wider discussion. I am one of the founders of the old National Education League, which was established in the sixties. Our programme was for compulsory education, and what was called the secular school. The secularists have got a bad name since those days. The case with which we were dealing then was different from that which we are now considering. We held that the secular school was the only solution. But full discussion reveals other possible alternatives, and I must confess that when we stood on the secular platform in Birmingham we were absolutely defeated by the people who, rightly or wrongly, decided that they would have some form of religious teaching in the public elementary schools. So, in this instance, if you could continue to discuss matters long enough—and the end would justify any length of discussion—they would then find whether there was any alternative to this co-called secular school; they would then see public opinion coming nearer or going further away from the principle, for it is a principle, that in our schools the State should have nothing to do with religious teaching. But that discussion is denied to us here, and the question will have to be thrashed out in the constituencies. If this Bill becomes law through lack of discussion it will be the beginning of a theological strife of such bitterness and of such wide extent as to make the strife experienced in past years quite small in comparison. Bear in mind that there has never been any difficulty with the parents, and there never has been any difficulty with the children anywhere. The difficulty lies with the militant religious sections. You tender them this agreement, and when this

Bill becomes law they will make their churches and chapels and meeting-places arenas of an opposition so vigorous that it will out-do all that has gone before. I know that it is useless to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman, and therefore we must trust to getting a discussion in the only place we have left in the Parliamentary institution of this country. Discussion in this House is denied to us, and we must trust to getting it in another place. I for one, like many others around me and in the country, never thought that the day would come when we would have to say: "Thank God we have a House of Lords."

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) said that most Members on that side of the House would agree with what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He thought that those who were genuinely desirous that a settlement of this so-called difficulty should take place must feel that such a settlement was absolutely impossible unless sufficient time was given to Members of the House to discuss thoroughly and fully the new and somewhat complicated measure which had only recently been placed in their hands. There could be no doubt whatever that there was a consensus of opinion among all parties in that House that a settlement of this question was eminently desirable, and personally he had shown that he fell in with those who held this view, as he thought nearly all did, by the vote he gave last night. At the same time he felt that it would be impossible for him and others who felt with him, to vote for the Third Reading of this Bill unless certain alterations were made in some of its clauses and unless sufficient time was given to enable the House thoroughly and properly to discuss it. In some of the rather lachrymose speeches which had been delivered in the course of the debate that day they had heard a great deal about the strife and contention that had been going on for the last twelve years in connection with religious teaching. The hon. Member opposite representing a Welsh constituency in the very eloquent speech which he delivered last night referred to the fact, or the alleged fact, that, in consequence of this strife and contention, no educational progress had been made during those twelve years. That statement was almost similar to one which fell from the Prime Minister when he was speaking on this subject. From his own experience he wanted emphatically to deny that statement. It was quite true that on the platforms and in the House of Commons there had been shown great differences of opinion, which had led people to think that there was strife going on all through the country on this religious question, but he must emphatically state that these differences had not been experienced in the schools, and the agitation was fortunately outside our educational institutions. Perhaps it was partly for that reason that the country had made during the last twelve years enormous progress in, he believed, every branch of education. That being the case, of course, this settlement did not appear to him to be so urgent as it might seem to other Members, and he should have very much have preferred it if the adequate discussion of the subject and the further consideration of the Bill could have been left over to the commencement of another session. He could not, for his own part, see the need for this great hurry and haste in the settlement of the question, and he believed that they would come to the discussion very much better prepared to make compromises and to arrive at a conclusion which would be generally acceptable if they had time carefully to think over what the Bill really meant, not only from the religious but from the educational standpoint. He believed that very few persons could have had time sufficiently to consider the Bill, or to know what its effect might be upon other schools, and he should have welcomed the opportunity which would have been open to them, if the Bill had stood over until the commencement of next session, for giving it thorough and careful consideration. He could quite understand the desire on the part of the Government to accelerate the passage of the Bill. They had been told over and over again that everybody was tired of the controversy. It was pointed out by his hon. friend the Member for Glasgow University that, although some people might be tired of the discussion, that was no reason why, when the matter had to be considered, they should arrive at a conclusion hastily. Further than that, it seemed to him very dangerous indeed to endeavour to settle an important question in that House not only when those who were most capable of giving an opinion on the subject were tired of the whole question at the fag-end of the session, but when they were nearly all worn out and he believed incapable of putting into its consideration that amount of intelligence which an important question of this kind really required. Not only was the Bill not to be carried over to the beginning of another session, for he understood that to be the decision, but the time to be given to the discussion of its various clauses was so limited that it was almost impossible to deal with them in the manner in which they ought to be dealt with. It was very desirable indeed that they should have an opportunity of hearing what the teachers of the different kinds of schools had to say as to the practicability of many of the clauses and of their bearing on the general arrangements of the schools. No opportunity of that kind was given. They had no opportunity, as many of them would like to have had, of discussing these questions with the various associations of teachers, which were constituted for the very purpose of considering questions of this character. On the contrary, they were called upon hastily and hurriedly to put down ill-digested Amendments which possibly ought not to be put down because they had not had time properly to consider what Amendments ought to be put down to a measure of this kind. He was sure that no one attached greater importance to a careful consideration of this kind than the President of the Board of Education, and he would appeal to him even at that late hour to confer with his colleagues as to the possibility of postponing the consideration of the measure until the beginning of next year. He believed that the Government would lose nothing by it. He was quite certain that education would gain by it. He believed that if such a postponement were possible, there would be more chance not only of a compromise but of a permanent settlement of this important question, which would prevent its being raised in any form for at least some twenty or thirty years to come.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover): I wish to explain in a very few words my reason for opposing the Motion of the Government. I feel the more bound to do since, whilst I duly recognise the concession of two days to be made by the Prime Minister, that concession does not affect or modify either of the two grounds upon which my opposition to the Motion is based. I understand that the Government have taken the course of moving this closure by compartments Resolution, on the morrow of the Second Reading of the Bill, in order that Parliament may be prorogued before Christmas instead of adjourning over Christmas. I recognise that that would be a matter of convenience to Members in whatever quarter of the House they sit, but we should purchase that convenience at too dear a price. It will involve the loss of two things which we shall live to deplore. The first thing that we shall lose, by hurrying this Bill through, is the chance of a lasting settlement based upon a mutual understanding of our respective positions. I am talking to the Members of this House. I am well aware that outside of this House there are many persons of the greatest eminence who are deservedly revered and who have come, or very nearly come to something approaching, though not reaching, an understanding. But that will prove of no avail to procure a lasting settlement unless the various sections in this House are also allowed to arrive at a mutual understanding of their respective positions. Anyone who has listened to the debate, whatever his persoanl view may be, must see that a different interpretation is placed in three or four quarters of the House on the approximate understanding which has been reached outside. Not a single Member has touched upon what we call contracting out without expressing regret at seeing it in the scheme of the Government Bill. It does not touch the religious question at all. It is a question of school efficiency. Everyone will admit that it goes back to the principle of conduct, and from the point of view of school efficiency ought not to take effect until every section of the House has weighed in the balance whether or not we ought to incur that loss. As for what action we ought to take, it is not a question only for our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen—and in this connection I may point out the irony of the situation in which we find ourselves. Only a few days ago, the House, by a great majority, expressed its wish to relieve our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens from certain disabilities which were largely sentimental in their character. Within three days of our expressing our goodwill towards our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen we are going to relegate them to a position far worse than that from which we wished to relieve them. There are religious difficulties in connection with the Navy and the Army. You cannot always have a captain of a ship who is able to minister to all the spiritual needs of the whole ship's company, but what you are saying here is: "We are sorry that that is so, but that being so all the Roman Catholics are to go on board a cheaper class of ironclad, and in addition pay something towards its cost. We cannot decide in one week on the question of contracting-out, apart from its religious aspect, and thus we are compelled by the Government to reinsert contracting out." The financial burdens of the local authorities will be enormously increased and the taxpayer will have to find the money for a large Parliamentary grant. I hear from the Prime Minister that the Schedule is to be revised for the purpose of giving a larger grant. That will place one large burden on the taxpayer and at the same time you have to provide for another burden which will be placed upon the ratepayer, because where there are contracting-out schools parents may demand that an undenominational school shall be erected at the cost of the ratepayer. In view of the present financial situation we ought not to rush through a measure which is going to put a further burden on the ratepayers and taxpayers of the country. How perfectly futile these precautions become when a few lines in italics, including so many matters of great educational and religious importance, are rushed through undebated at the completion of one day. Both these disabilities, namely, that we get a worse secular form of education under this Bill and put an unnecessary burden on the taxpayer and the ratepayer, arise from the fact that there has been no attempt at uniformity. It is because the Government have chosen to build their plans on a principle which is theoretically unfair that they are driven as the necessary corollary, both to contracting out and these extra financial burdens. How can we deal with these clauses under compartment Resolutions? How can we deal with the relation of the religious part of the Bill to the other parts of the Bill on this basis of theoretical unfairness? Any man who has a grievance can easily raise popular feeling; he can point to such and such a thing as unfair and appeal to an audience of his countrymen. Englishmen greatly believe in the principles of fairness, and every audience he appeals to will support him if he can show that the thing of which he complains is unfair. The result of rushing this Bill through will not be to get a lasting settlement. It will merely be to set up a sorry target for all those who are not in agreement with it to fire at. By insisting on proroguing Parliament before Christmas we shall lose the chance of settling this question. If we pass this Motion of the Government we shall lose the right of the House of Commons to the place it ought to enjoy in the counsels of the State. All we have to do then is to see that the Bill is carried. Our place in the counsels of the nation will be less than that of those many eminent persons previously consulted by the Cabinet on this matter. We recognise in these days, when the State is taking to itself many functions previously left to the general public, that power is thrown more and more on the Cabinet and Committees of the Cabinet. But if the Cabinet are to decide questions after consultations with people who are not Members of Parliament at all, then they ought to extend that consultation to those who, after all, are the elected representatives of the people. It is not so long ago that no such Motion as a closure Resolution formed part of our practice, and it was only very rarely that such a Motion was accepted. It has grown, however, to be the normal procedure of the present Government, but still we may say that, though it is the normal procedure, some exceptions should be made to it, and if any exceptions should be made surely it is in regard to a Bill that is utterly valueless unless it is an agreed Bill, agreed between all parties of the House.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) did not think that the Prime Minister quite appreciated the nature of the complaint they made. It was not so much that the time allotted was insufficient, but that neither they nor those they represented or were associated with had breathing space to understand what the provisions of the Bill were or whether it provided a basis of settlement. Their contention was—and no extension of time allotted would remove it—that if they took a Bill like this and stuck to it *de die in diem* no good result could be obtained. The Act of 1902 was brought in in March after negotiations with all sorts of persons had been going on since the October previous. The Second Reading took place in May and the Committee in the following July, and thirty days were taken on that Bill before the closure was moved. Altogether seventy days were taken on that Bill, and his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition got through all the really contentious portions of the Bill without any other than the closure possible under the ordinary rules. He was speaking from memory. He had also tried to find out in the short time at his disposal what was the time taken in passing the Act of 1870, which had achieved a settlement for thirty years. The preparation for that Bill began in 1869. The memorandum was submitted on 21st October, 1869, to the Cabinet which discussed the lines on which the Bill should go. The Cabinet decided that a Bill on those lines should be printed on 24th November. It did not pass through the Cabinet until 4th February, 1870, and was introduced on 8th February. On its introduction there were only two opponents to it, yet five weeks were allowed to elapse before the Second Reading. Its Second Reading passed without a division, which clearly showed it to be an agreed Bill. A good three months elapsed before the Bill went to the Committee stage, and all parties had full opportunity of looking at its chief points. At that time the Liberal Government was all powerful. It had come in on a new franchise, was possessed of greater moral power than any Parliament of the last century. The Bill came on for Committee in June, and many drastic changes took place. The Committee stage lasted fifteen days and there were five days on Report. There were two days on the Third Reading, which was passed on 22nd July, 1870. When they considered that the Bill now before the House was just as important as the Act of 1870 and aroused passions probably far greater than those aroused in 1870, he submitted that it was perfectly impossible either to describe this Bill in any sense as an agreed Bill or to discuss the details in the time given so as to ensure a permanent and lasting settlement. After noting some of the problems involved in the first three clauses of the Bill, he said he did not profess to say that no settlement was possible, either on these or on other lines, which would meet the wishes of those who admittedly could not conform to the normal type of school. But if they had to engage in the discussion of these matters without previous deliberation, an agreement would not be possible, and the whole settlement proposed by the Bill would be defeated at the start. If the Government had devoted their attention to a Bill of this sort earlier in the year there might have been a better chance of an accommodation. But this time last year they announced their intention to bring in a measure that should be short, sharp, and drastic, and that intention was entirely fulfilled by the Bill they subsequently introduced. That Bill vitiated all educational progress down to the moment, less than ten days ago, when its withdrawal was announced. If it were the intention of the Government to arrive at a settlement, he implored them not to press this Motion, but to allow ample breathing space to all those parties whose dearest interests were involved, and to give them time to consider their position. If the Prime Minister went on, not only could there be no settlement, but a new wrong would be created far exceeding in bitterness and intensity any grievances which they could have felt under the provisions of the present law.

Mr. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) said there seemed to be a universal feeling on the part of the House that rather more time than the Prime Minister had allowed ought to be given to this measure. His right hon. friend had so far admitted that complaint that he had extended the time for the Committee stage by a couple of days. That could hardly be regarded as quite satisfactory. This was an enormously important matter, and could hardly be discussed in a proper fashion in the time allotted. He had never been able to make out why Bills were not carried over to the following session. He felt that if this Bill went through its primary stages before Christmas it was a Bill which might be very well carried over to next session. Of course, the big difficulty was the Christmas holidays. They were entitled to a certain amount of holidays. For two years hon. Members had been sitting in the House all the year round, and they were not so much in touch with their constituencies as they ought to be. The Education Bill was a measure in regard to which hon. Members ought to go to their constituents and try to find out the views of Churchmen and Nonconformists alike. He thought it would be disastrous if Members had to tell their constituents that the Bill had been forced through at a rapid rate. He hoped the Government would give more time to the measure, and suggested that they could do so by carrying it forward to next session, as he understood they intended to do in the case of the Irish Land Bill.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) congratulated the Government on the great skill with which the Prime Minister conducted his Resolution. The right hon. Gentleman made use of a familiar device by naming a time which was obviously and patently absurd, and then, with a great show of moderation and fairness, extending it. It was really absurd to compel the House to discuss the Bill in Committee, even in the period so extended. The Prime Minister's assertion that there was nothing new in the Bill was not borne out by the facts. There were at least three propositions in it which were entirely novel—universal compulsory Cowper-Temple teaching, the right of entry to all schools, and contracting-out on a large scale—which, though they had received some discussion, had never been fully discussed, and had never before been proposed by a responsible Government as a solution of the problem. The House, therefore, had to deal with a Bill which was really novel in many respects and was far-reaching in its consequences. Ministerial supporters said that it was practically an agreed measure; but he would remind them that 157 Members went into the lobby against it on the Motion for its Second Reading. That was a very much larger number than usually voted in this Parliament against the Government, and an enormous majority of those who so voted were actuated by the strongest possible feeling, compared with which ordinary political convictions were trifles light as air. It was absurd, ridiculous, and even untrue to say that this was almost an agreed Bill. What reason was there for saying that it must be got through this session? Why should not the Bill be brought forward next session, its First and Second Readings taken on one day as there was precedent for doing, and then its consideration in Committee calmly proceeded with? He asked hon. Members on the Ministerial side to consider carefully the nature of the precedent which they were setting up. Here was a Bill, novel, complicated, bitterly opposed on the strength of the most conscientious and profound convictions, and it was to be carried through the House within three weeks, at the outside, from the time of its First Reading. He would probably have no opportunity of sitting on the Treasury bench, and, therefore, would not have the gloomy satisfaction of treating hon. Gentlemen opposite as badly as they were now treating the present Opposition, but some of his friends might have that melancholy satisfaction. He could conceive a novel Budget imposing a fiscal revolution on the country, a Budget which would be open to great misconstruction in the country. What a valuable precedent there would be for that in this Bill. What was to prevent such a Budget being passed through all its stages in three weeks? And in that case there would be no opportunity of revision by the other House, so that hon. Members opposite would be in an even worse case than was the present Opposition. Were they going by their votes to make such a thing possible?

MR. MALLET (Plymouth) asked if the noble Lord really suggested that that was a course which his political friends were likely to pursue.

LORD R. CECIL replied that he was not sufficiently in their confidence to know, but he would find it exceedingly difficult to condemn them if they took it. He saw no distinction in principle between the proceedings that afternoon and the hypothetical case which he had laid before the House. There was more than a chance, there was a practical certainty, that any ordinary Government Bill would be opposed, and that the Opposition would use all the forms of the House to defeat it; but was there any probability of that in this case? Opposition to the measure came from all quarters of the House. It was essential that a proposition of this kind should be carried out without anything approaching obstruction, as the feelings of all the various sections of the Opposition had to be considered, and the old wholesome rule that used to exist in the House when there was a genuine, corporate self-respect would for a time be restored. Therefore, so far as what was called obstruction was concerned there was not the slightest need for the guillotine. The real reason was that the Government were afraid that if the measure was properly considered and discussed it would be rejected. What possible opportunity had this democratic Parliament given to the people of the country to consider the provisions of the Bill? Not a thousandth part of them realised what they were. By the time the Bill was through the House they would begin for the first time to understand what it was proposed to enact. To hope that procedure of that kind would lead to conciliation was simply insanity. He remembered that Newman reproached Dr. Pusey for discharging an olive branch as if from a catapult. The Government were discharging their olive branch from a 4·7 cannon. It was grotesque to imagine that anyone would accept an olive branch so tendered. So far from closing the controversy, it would merely open up a new and far more bitter chapter in the future.

MR. BYLES agreed with the main argument of the hon. Member for Sevenoaks that the Government should do everything possible to convince those with whom it was entering into alliance and give them as much time as was necessary to break down opposition. He hoped to rope in a good many of those Members who, as the noble Lord reminded the House, had voted against the Second Reading last night. The argument with regard to the length of time given to the discussion of this controversy in 1870 and 1902 did not impress him. This Bill was put forward as practically agreed upon by both sides—[Cries of "No"]—and should be regarded as one on which much opposition would not arise. Therefore much time would not be needed for the ratification of the agreement that had been come to. If the proposal to leave this matter over to next session were conceded by the Government, he would be very glad to agree to it. He would vote for the Amendment put forward by the hon. Member for Sevenoaks in order to express his intense desire that both parties should acquiesce in this general agreement. He maintained further that these repeated guillotine Motions were having the effect of destroying the virtue of Parliament. They were impairing the authority and sanction of its decisions and public respect for its enactments. He did not believe that it was the only way, as they were continually told, of getting measures through the House of Commons. This method was increasing the power of the Executive. That was a very dangerous power. If one of the new Members of the House could go back twenty years he would realise the liberties he had lost, what an unimportant item the private Member had become, and how much less powerful and influential were his remaining duties and privileges in the House than they were in those days. The Executive was one thing and the

House of Commons was another, and he believed the House of Commons would one day, and he hoped it would not be long, reassert itself and determine to put an end for ever to this machine-like method of getting through great measures presented by the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): The observations of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down fell naturally and appropriately into two parts. He dealt with the special circumstances under which this Bill is brought forward. He was not unmindful of the general question that lies behind it—namely, the method in which this House has in the past conducted and is in the future to conduct its deliberations. Perhaps the House will permit me to say something on both those aspects of the question, partly in reply to the hon. Gentleman, and partly because I have a statement to make with regard to the more general question on my own behalf, and on behalf of those who sit on this Bench, which has a bearing upon our future proceedings. I begin with the particular aspect of this problem that relates to this Bill. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has repeated, not as a mere unusual statement, but with emphasis and with obvious conviction, that this is an agreed Bill.

MR. BYLES: I said that it was intended to be an agreed Bill, that it was put forward as an agreed Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member said that it was put forward as an agreed Bill. I will do the Government justice; I do not think that they have ever said the Bill is an agreed Bill. They could not have said that with the smallest regard to the plain and obvious verities of the situation. It is a Bill on which all of us hope, and some of us think, that you may ultimately get agreement, but it is not an agreed Bill, nor has it any of the characteristics which justify that epithet. It is certainly not an agreed Bill with any political party. It is certainly not an agreed Bill, as I understand it, with the great bulk of any religious community. It certainly is not even an agreed Bill, unless I am greatly mistaken, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and those Members of the episcopal bench who have been most closely associated with him in these negotiations. If the hon. Gentleman will read the letter of the Bishop of London in this morning's paper, which was referred to by my hon. friend the Member for Sevenoaks when he proposed on behalf of the Opposition his Amendment, he will see how very far from the truth, even with regard to those who are working most closely with the Archbishop, is the statement that in their view it is an agreed Bill. As for the Archbishop himself, we know authentically nothing subsequent to the last letter which appeared in the truncated correspondence which is all that we have as passing between him and the Government; and unless rumours are quite beside the mark—and very likely they are—even now the Archbishop is far from thinking that this is a Bill on which he and the Government are agreed. Perhaps, if I am wrong in that statement, the Minister for Education, who is alleged by his followers, though not by me, to have presented this Bill as an agreed Bill, will put me right when he rises to reply. This is a Bill which all of us hope, and some of us think, may be made the basis of agreement, but it is in no sense an agreed Bill, nor are the canons with regard to Parliamentary time, properly applicable to an agreed Bill, appropriate on this occasion. It is quite true, and it has constantly happened in the memory of old Parliamentary hands, that an agreement has been come to between the two sides of the House with regard to some measure, and the whole thing has been hurried through with extraordinary speed and with less than the amount of discussion which everybody would regard as proper, simply because it was an agreed Bill and everybody wanted to get to the end of it. That was a perfectly familiar Parliamentary proceeding. That is not the procedure appropriate to this occasion, nor the procedure the Government ought to pursue, if they want this Bill, when it gets to the Third Reading, to be a really agreed basis of a permanent compromise. The Government themselves have almost admitted that. The Prime Minister has made a concession, for which, as it is a concession, I am grateful of course, in the way of adding two days to the time to be given to the compartments. It is a concession, but the Government will not think me ungracious if I say that it seems to me to be utterly inadequate to the real necessities of the situation, not merely the necessities of the discussion within the walls of this House, but the necessities of the discussion within the walls of this House in their relation to the public opinion of the country. After all I never desired or asked that this House should reflect from day to day the changing moods of the constituencies outside. I quite think that this House should have an opinion of its own, reflecting no doubt, so far as it can, the ultimate views of the people, but based upon that knowledge which we have and which the community outside cannot have in the same measure or degree, and the mere fact that there may be a feeling against a measure in the country is not an adequate reason for our entirely changing our policy on any particular question. But, while granting that as a fundamental axiom of Parliamentary government, have not I got every man who is listening to me in agreement with me when I say that we cannot have adequate discussion of a complicated measure touching closely interests, prejudices if you will, convictions of every class in every part of the community, unless we know how our proposals and the proposals of the Government strike those who are most nearly and immediately affected? Does anybody doubt that? If they do not doubt that proposition, may I ask whether anybody can put his hand on his heart and say that in his opinion, the Nonconformist opinion, the Church opinion, the educational layman's opinion in all parts of the country, is so seised of the details of this measure and is so adequately informed as to the effect that it will have in his particular district and on his particular interests, that we can come to the discussion of the Government proposals adequately equipped to deal with the complex problems which are brought before us? Several Gentlemen on the other side have expressed the same views as I do. My hon. friend near me speaking for the Opposition bench and my two right hon. friends the Member for Dover and the Member for Worcestershire, who have also spoken, while holding different views as to the possibility of making this Bill into the desired compromise, are absolutely at one in their view that the only shadow or glimmer of hope which exists for obtaining that most desirable end is to give not merely this House, but the country, on which this House ultimately depends, some opportunity of forming a considered judgment on the Government proposals. There is one more point, before leaving that branch of the subject which I think has not been touched upon. I do not think it is possible for any Government or any draftsmen to cook up with sufficient rapidity a really watertight Bill in the time which has been given to this Government to do it. Remember the Parliamentary strain under which we have been living these last two years. I have some knowledge of the inside working of Governmental business. I know the pressure upon all Ministers of the Crown, not merely the Prime Minister, who is, I understand, largely responsible for this work. The body of draftsmen at the command of the Government have been engaged in I do not know how many measures, all complicated, and all difficult to prepare in a hurry. I do not believe it is possible for the Government to have produced in this measure their own scheme in the best shape in which it ought to be presented to the House, and when we come to examine it, in order to carry out the very scheme of the Government, we shall not be able to avoid important Amendments. That is an additional reason for giving the House of Commons time to do that which I am sure the Government have not had time to do.

Now I have something to say to the House on a point touched upon by the last speaker—namely, the relationship which closure by compartment Resolutions have had in the past, are now having, and will have in the future upon the practice of this legislative body. I suppose during the last three years I have made speeches upon every one of the guillotine Resolutions which the present Government have brought forward, and in the course of those speeches I have, no doubt, wearied the House with some descriptions of the history of these Motions. But, as this is very likely the last speech which I shall ever make upon this subject, may I recapitulate that history? The history of closure by compartments goes back twenty-one years. The first closure by compartment Resolution was made on the Criminal Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill—generally called the Crimes Act—of which I was in charge. That Bill was fought in a manner to which this present Parliament is an absolute stranger. We fought night after night, sitting continuously from four in the afternoon till four the next morning. We were sixteen days in Committee before the Government was driven, rightly or wrongly, to resort to the expedient which we now so light-heartedly and so frequently adopt. That Crimes Act was, in the opinion of the Government, an absolute and pressing necessity from the point of view of public safety. We endured sixteen days of discussion—not ending at 11 o'clock, but going on until mere physical exhaustion reduced us all to silence—before resorting to closure by compartment. We had to follow the example in regard to the appointment of the Parnell Special Commission, which created great controversy. The next case of closure by compartment was the Home Rule Bill of 1893. The Government of 1893 allowed the Opposition to discuss that Bill for twenty-eight days before they thought the position had become intolerable, from their point of view. There were these three cases between 1887 and 1893. The same Government brought forward in 1894 the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, which they regarded as a matter dealing with the immediate safety of law and order in Ireland. Up to the general election of 1895 there were only four cases of closure by compartment, two of them under the Unionist Government, two of them under the Radical Government. Then came the long term of office of the Unionist Party, beginning in 1895 and 1896, and ending in the last weeks of 1905. In those ten years closure by compartment was applied only three times. First there was the Education Act of 1902. That measure lasted forty-five days altogether, and thirty-eight days were spent in Committee before the closure was applied. All great controversial points in that Bill were discussed over and over again in Committee before the closure by compartment was applied. The other two occasions were the Licensing Bill of 1904 and the Aliens Bill of 1905. On the slender basis of these three cases in ten years we have been denounced in this House and in the country as a Government and a party grossly neglectful of the liberties of Parliament, anxious on all occasions to "gag" legitimate debate, and as desirous of accumulating in our own administrative hands all the powers which ought to have been shared with this deliberate Assembly. Then, on the strength of that charge, in language which it is not worth while reviving, although it was admirable from the point of view of eloquence by hon. Gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury benches, the party opposite, vowed to Parliamentary liberties, the party who, by their criticisms, committed themselves to the view that resorting to closure by compartment three times in ten years was "gross neglect of the liberties of Parliament," came into power with an absolutely overwhelming majority. How have they given evidence to the country of their practical belief in these theoretical professions? Since they met in the plenitude of their power, and all the early enthusiasms of a young Parliament, with their large majority at their back, they have adopted closure by compartment no less than eleven times. This is the eleventh occasion within three years on which the leader of the House has asked the House to divest itself of all its traditional liberties, and that before any proof had been given that those liberties were going to be abused. If hon. Gentleman desire me to give these eleven cases I will tell them. [Cries of "No," "Agreed," and an HON. MEMBER: You have said you want time.] The eleven occasions are — The Education Bill, the Plural Voting Bill, the Territorial Forces Bill, the Evicted

Tenants Bill, the Small Landowners Bill, the Small Holdings Bill, the Small Landowners (No. 2) Bill, the Land Values Bill, the Old-Age Pensions Bill, the Licensing Bill, and now this Education Bill. I have given the House this brief history because I want them to understand what is absolutely undeniable on the face of the facts, that what was an occasional expedient of the previous Administrations has now become an habitual method of conducting Parliamentary proceedings. I have, I believe, on every one of the preceding ten occasions on which this closure by compartment has been moved, explained that this constant practice was undermining and, indeed, destroying all our ancient rights and liberties. Unfortunately a minority small as we are are absolutely helpless, and all that we can do is to make an appeal as to what is the common interests of all sides. I have not made the appeal in any unreasonable form. I have not asked hon. Members to do what, of course, a party never will do, which is to go on each occasion into the lobby in great bodies against the Government which they are supporting. There may be occasional sporadic desertions by this or that hon. Gentleman, but even he would not vote against the Government if he thought it would lead to their defeat. And, therefore, I do not ask, and I have never asked anything so unreasonable as that hon. Gentlemen opposite should show their objection to a policy by clearing out the Government which they support. But there are perfectly well-known methods by which a party can clearly indicate to those whom it loyally follows that this or that course is one which they cannot long tolerate. It is not done openly by any public exhibition of disloyalty; it is done by that quiet impression of a view widely held (I do not care what the normal majority of that Government may be), and of which no Government can be either ignorant or neglectful. Everybody knows that these appeals have fallen upon deaf ears. I have consulted with my friends on this bench, and, speaking for them, I have to say that their deliberate decision is that these appeals can no longer be made. The time has come when it is really a farce for anybody on this bench to get up and in any reasoned speech to tell the House what is the inevitable goal towards which it is proceeding. My colleagues and I on this bench think that, after this experience, we have now, however reluctantly and however sorrowfully, to regard this closure by compartments as part of the settled practical procedure of the House. We have to look at facts as we find them, and I do not propose to make any further protest on this point. I shall henceforth regard closure by compartments as a thing to be voted against, like the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule, and shall simply walk into the lobby against them, but a reasoned argument on an appeal I shall no longer make from these benches. I shall regard it as a settled practice of this Government, and I shall, of course, preserve the rights of the successors of this Government, so far as I can speak for them, if they ever have successors; but in so far as we on these benches can lay down a statement in regard to the future of the party to which we belong, I say after three years bitter experience that this closuring is the settled policy of the House of Commons; we will no longer pretend that guillotining is an exceptional measure, and whenever by the turn of fortune anybody who sits on this bench or behind me shall ultimately sit on that bench, if they find themselves in a position which makes it more convenient to use the weapon against which we have protested, but, alas! protested in vain, then, of course—and I say so quite openly, and who is going to say that I am wrong?——

MR. BYLES: The right hon. Gentleman himself has been arguing all along that it is wrong.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. I have not. If the hon. Gentleman would do me the honour to listen to an argument not very obscure he would see that what I have said is that, so long as this was not plainly a settled practice of the House, it was right and proper that I should do my best to make the House feel that if they allowed it to become a settled practice their ancient liberties were gone. When it is a settled practice of the House, let me tell the hon. Gentleman, it must not be a settled practice for one side of the House and not for the other. If that be admitted, I suppose we must regard this afternoon's debate as, if not a turning point, at all events a moment in our Parliamentary history at which a process which perhaps has gradually been coming on is finally settled and admitted. None of us can look such an event in the face without a feeling of deep regret. Old things have passed away. I do not now ask who is to blame for it. Whoever is to blame for it, if there is blame anywhere, it is with those who proposed the eleven closures in three years, and not with those who proposed it three times in ten years. All of us who have been in the House of Commons for the whole of our working lives must feel that when the events which have been moving slowly and at the last rapidly in this direction have finally reached a crisis in which the most strenuous advocate of Parliamentary liberties feels that the force of circumstances is too strong, that the new order has begun, and the old order has departed—we cannot come to such a moment without feelings of the profoundest regret and the deepest emotion. I do not deny that I am weary of making these perpetual protestations, or that I individually regard the future relief from the task as so far a personal alleviation of the duties of the position I hold, but as a Member of Parliament, as one of this Assembly who, in Opposition and in the Government, has regarded the debates between the two sides as the most important, the most interesting as well as the most exacting part of a not easy life—as a Member of the House of Commons with these long memories behind me, I confess that I have made this speech with feelings of profoundest regret and with a feeling of the deepest disquietude for the future.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The House must be well aware that nothing would be more easy than to elaborate a *tu quoque* argument on this subject. I have no intention of quoting the right hon. Gentleman against himself, but the right hon. Gentleman himself, when he was responsible for the business of the House, resorted to the closure as a method of conducting business.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Three times in ten years.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): After twenty-six days in Committee.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I can only remark that if the application of the closure is an invasion of the rights and liberties of the House the right hon. Gentleman has himself been guilty of that invasion, and it, therefore, becomes a matter of arithmetical calculation as to which is the more guilty party. [An hon. Member on the OPPOSITION benches: Not a very difficult calculation.] I cannot imagine what use there is, throughout the whole of a Parliamentary afternoon, in throwing to and fro such accusations. Everyone admits that if opposition is organised against any great Bill in the House, it is almost impossible to get it through without an allocation of time at some stage or another of the proceedings. A small opposition of even twenty men can keep the whole business of Parliament delayed. But it is quite unnecessary for me to go into discussion on that subject now. I do not believe that this is a turning point in the history of the closure. Everybody knows that if the right hon. Gentleman returned to office he would return to closure; and I doubt whether any successors of the present Government would be able to get business through the House without some artificial allocation of time. I hope after the discussion we have had this afternoon that the House will be able to come to a conclusion on the Amendment. My right hon. friend beside me has suggested a concession to extend the time for consideration of the Bill in Committee by two days. I hope, Sir, the House will now come to a decision on the Amendment and allow us to carry out in accordance with Parliamentary usage the form which the Prime Minister has intimated that we are prepared to accept.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) said he rose to support the Amendment on several grounds connected with the Bill. They had heard a good deal about negotiations, but, as he said a few days ago, there would not probably be a single Liberal Member who would have put these proposals before his constituency at the last election. At the last election the five or six millions of working-class parents of the children who went to elementary schools had an opportunity of making a pronouncement as to what they required done with regard to the education settlement. Something perfectly new and absolutely irreconcilable with what was then proposed was now submitted in the form of a compromise, and there had not been a single person communicated with who was the father of a child who would be affected by this legislation. The Government beyond question, when there was any special reference to questions affecting the Labour party usually communicated with that party, but on this question which affected the working classes of the country, for which that party pre-eminently stood, they had not called into negotiation a single representative. He said that for the Government to attempt to rush through these proposals, having an absolutely vital effect upon the future child life of the working classes of the country, without those working classes, either through their representatives or directly, having a real opportunity of examining into, or considering, or ascertaining precisely what would be the effect of those proposals, was an attempt to ignore the democratic principle upon which the Government professed to be elected. But there was another consideration. Unfortunately in connection with this proposal there had been such an unseemly scramble, not only on the part of members of the Government, but on the part of the Liberal Press, to get rid of the question that the criticisms which were really damaging to the character of the measure were not being fully put before the electors. Further than that, the measure came at a particularly unfortunate time. This was an attempt to rush perfectly new proposals—absolutely and perfectly new proposals—[Cries of "No."] Hon. Members might say "No," but he said they were absolutely new proposals, and they came at a time not only when the Press was desirous of getting the question out of the way and were rendering magnificently loyal service to the Government in their attempt to secure that, but when unfortunately the public were not allowed to come into the Strangers Gallery and see what was being done. He therefore said, and he said it advisedly, that at this moment it was unfair to the great working-class population of the country, and to the great bulk of those people who had put the Government in power, that these proposals should be rushed, and he begged the Government for the sake of the future of Liberalism, of the people's schools, and of a real and permanent settlement, that an opportunity might be given for delay, to take the people of the country into their confidence, and to let Members of the House have an opportunity over the Christmas vacation of consulting their constituents, so that they might know exactly what was required. If that was not done, he should support the Amendment against the attempt of the Government to rush the Bill.

MR. ASHLEY thought the Minister for Education entirely missed the point of his right hon. friend's argument. The right hon. Gentleman implied and admitted that there were undoubtedly occasions, there must be occasions, owing to the perfection to which obstruction had been brought on both sides of the House, on which the closure was necessary and justified; but it was a very different thing to apply the closure three times in ten years, as the late Government did after prolonged discussion in Committee, after every one of the main principles of the Bills had been discussed *ad nauseam*, and to propose to closure eleven Bills in two and a half years, and practically not to leave a single Bill without the application of the closure before any opportunity for obstruction, had it been intended, had occurred. He asked the House to cast its mind back to the Army Bill of last year. How could the Government have expected that there would be any organised obstruction to that Bill? It was a measure brought in by the Government to perfect our auxiliary forces, and although some Members on that side did not see eye to eye with the Government in the proposals they had made, yet the criticism was quite friendly, and no organised opposition could have been anticipated and effected. And yet what did the Government do before they had opened their mouths to say one word about the Army Bill? A closure Motion was put down, and several of the most important parts of the provisions regarding our land forces were cut off from discussion. In this case similarly there were a great number of Members who disagreed with many provisions of the Bill, but he did not think there were a great number, or indeed any, who did not wish for a compromise on this burning question, if that compromise could be obtained on fair terms. He was sure that the Catholic community, who were a very strong and numerous body in his constituency, were perfectly willing to remain in the national system, they heartily desired to remain in it, if the Government would allow them, but if they were cast out adequate money should be given to them. There would be no opposition from below the gangway, nor upon his part, as representing a large number of Catholics, if the Government would give them full time to discuss the question of single-school areas and the legitimate grievance of the Nonconformists when they only had a Church school in their area. But let the House consider—the right hon. Member for Sheffield had expatiated on it before—the ridiculously small amount of time given to discuss these important proposals. One day was to be given to the extinction of thousands of elementary schools all over the country. On the same day they had to decide what should be the State religion in those schools and the endowment of that State religion. Surely, however anxious they were to get this matter out of the way, they could not, with any sense of responsibility to those who sent them there, go and dispose of these things, which vitally affected the interests of the country, in the short space of a Parliamentary day. Then, taking Clause 2, they were to have a day and a half to consider questions of vital importance. The whole question of the right of entry, which had been fought about for years, was to be discussed in a day and a half. They would have to discuss how many mornings a week and what time in the mornings were to be taken up, and whether the teacher was to be the religious teacher or not. Surely these things ought to be given a great deal of discussion as they affected an enormous body of teachers. Then they were to discuss the most important question of the grounds on which the local education authority might refuse to give facilities at all. He said without fear of contradiction that none of the most important provisions would be discussed. It was proposed to take on the last day but one, subsection (5) of Clause 10. If they put aside for a moment the religious question, this was by far and away the most important clause that had been discussed in the present Parliament. It solemnly asked the House to put the Minister for Education above the law, and if it were passed the right hon. Gentleman would be able to do anything he liked. He was placed by it in a superior position to His Majesty, because, although the King was above the law, he was, through his Ministers, responsible to the law; but by this subsection the House was going to say that the Minister for Education could do anything he liked and not be called to account by anyone. It might be said that the Minister for Education would observe the law, but in reply to that suggestion he would only say that his predecessors in office had not. It was the Secretary to the Admiralty who had aided and abetted the school authorities in the West Riding to abolish the voluntary schools, which they did until the voluntary schools managers appealed to Mr. Justice Channell, who decided that the law must be obeyed, and that the Courts of Justice were the proper tribunals to enforce it. If the House were not to be able to discuss whether a Government Department should be placed above the law, then their discussion had become a perfect farce. On behalf of his constituents, he emphatically protested against only eight working days in Committee and two on Report being given to a measure which, in his opinion, was more important than any that had been discussed by this Parliament. In the two days on Report they had to put right all the mistakes in the Bill, and only one day was given to the Third Reading. He emphatically protested against the action of the Government.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said the hon. Member for Denbigh Boroughs was alone among the Members for Wales in the line which he had taken. There was no Member for Wales who did not know that the right of entry was odious to his constituents, and it was with a full sense of responsibility that they had decided to support the Bill. He hoped therefore that the Government would give as much time as they could to the discussion of the right of entry clause which must be fully considered if it was to meet with acceptance. He believed the Catholics had a strong claim and hoped that time would be given for consideration of the contracting out clauses. If the Government would give more time for the consideration of the Schedules and would increase the grant, they would improve the chance of effecting the compromise which he was anxious to see carried out.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 194; Noes, 71. (Div. List No. 418.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Branch, James

Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren,RtHn.SirC.B.(Leices.)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. G.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Rt.Hn.H.L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt Hn.SirThomasP.
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George

Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thornton, Percy M.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to leave out the word 'six,' and insert the word 'eight.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question, "That the word 'six' stand part of the Question"—put and negatived.

Question proposed, "That the word 'eight' be there inserted."

SIR F. BANBURY asked the Government whether they would not agree to insert the word "ten" in place of "eight." He did not wish to take up the time of the House because he knew that the concession made by the Government was better than nothing, but as they had now agreed to make a concession, he appealed to them to carry it a little further and make it ten instead of eight days. In event of the Government accepting the Amendment he had drawn up a time-table which was much the same as that drawn up by the right hon. Gentleman, so that there would be no need to waste time in drawing up a new one. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'eight,' and to insert the word 'ten.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'eight' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. ASQUITH: The hon. Baronet has been so moderate and persuasive that I certainly would have accepted his Amendment if I could have done so, but I cannot. I have made a considerable concession, and have with some difficulty readjusted the time-table so as to meet the allocation of eight days for Committee. I may point out that it is absolutely necessary that we should get our time-table before five o'clock, otherwise the alteration to eight instead of six days will be of no value.

LORD R. CECIL said he had not opposed the Amendment to leave out the word "six," but he would be compelled to vote against the insertion of the word "eight" because he had an Amendment on the Paper to insert the word "twelve."

Amendment to proposed Amendment negatived.

Question put, "That the word 'eight' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

New Table substituted.

Main Question, as amended, again proposed.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY pointed out that the House would be interested to know what the new table was. He thought that at least they should be told how the time was to be allocated before they were asked to decide the question.

MR. ASQUITH said that a copy of it had been supplied to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, but he would read it. The first day they would take Clause 1 and the Committee's discussion on the financial Resolutions; the second, Clause 2; the third, Clause 2 up to 7.30 and the report of the financial Resolutions till 10.30; the fourth, Clause 3; the fifth, Clause 4 till 7.30 and Clause 5 till 10.30; the sixth, Clauses 6 and 7 till 7.30 and Clauses 8 and 9 till 10.30; the seventh, Clauses 10, 11, and 12 and the new clauses; and the eighth, the first schedule till 7.30 and the remaining schedules and any other matters till 10.30.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): Will it be taken *de die in diem*?

MR. ASQUITH: Yes.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Has any attempt been made to divide Clause 2?

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir, but we have the whole of one day for it and till 7.30 on the next.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): Will there be a Saturday sitting?

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir, that is provided for.

LORD R. CECIL: Will there be a separate Saturday sitting for the Third Reading?

MR. ASQUITH: I do not wish to prejudge that unless the noble Lord wishes it.

Main Question, as amended, put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 192; Noes, 58. (Division List No. 419.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barrie, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H (Eessx, Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, D. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Rt Hn. Sir C. B. (Leices.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. G.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)

Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A, Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Rt. Hn. H. L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guiness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Keswick, William
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Arthur, Charles
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Claude Hay.

Ordered, That the Committee stage, Report stage, and Third Reading of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, and the necessary stages of the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with as follows:—1. Committee stage—Eight allotted days shall be given to the Committee stage of the Bill, including the necessary stages of the Financial Resolution relating to the Bill, and the proceedings on each of those allotted day shall be those shown in the second column of the table annexed to this Order, and those proceedings shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at the time shown in the third column of that table. 2. Report stage—Two allotted days shall be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and the proceedings for each of those allotted days shall be such as may be hereafter determined in manner provided by this Order, and those proceedings, if not previously brought to a conclusion, shall be brought to a conclusion at 10.30 p.m. on each such allotted day. 3. Third Reading—One allotted day shall be given to the Third Reading of the Bill, and the proceedings thereon shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at 10.30 p.m. on that day. On the conclusion of the Committee stage the Chairman shall report the Bill to the House without Question put, and the House shall on a subsequent day consider the proposals made by the Government for the allocation of the proceedings on the Report stage of the Bill. The proceedings on the consideration of those proposals may be entered on at any hour, though opposed, and shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House, but if they are not brought to a conclusion before the expiration of one hour after they have been commenced, Mr. Speaker shall, at the expiration of that time, bring them to a conclusion by putting the Question on the Motion proposed by the Government, after having put the Question, if necessary, on any Amendment or other Motion which has been already proposed from the Chair and not disposed of. After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Bill is put down as the first Order of the day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the day, followed by the Bill. Provided that 5 p.m. shall be substituted for 10.30 p.m., and 2 p.m. for 7.30 p.m. as respects any allotted day which is a Friday, and 3 p.m. shall be substituted for 10.30 p.m. and 12 noon for 7.30 p.m. as respects any allotted day which is a Saturday, as the time at which proceedings are to be brought to a conclusion under the foregoing provisions. A Motion may be made by a Minister of the Crown at the commencement of business on any day that the House sit on the following Saturday at 10 a.m. for the purpose of the consideration of the Bill, and the Question on any Motion so made shall be put forthwith by the Speaker without Amendment or debate. Notice of any Question requiring an oral answer for a Friday or Saturday shall, if that day is an allotted day under this Order, be treated as a notice for the following Monday. For the purpose of bringing to a conclusion any proceedings which are to be brought to a conclusion on an allotted day, and have not previously been brought to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman shall, at the time appointed under this Order for the conclusion of those proceedings, put forthwith the Question on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments, new Clauses, or Schedules moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, Clauses, or Schedules, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new Clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill as the case may be. A Motion may be made by the Government to leave out any Clause or consecutive Clauses of the Bill before the consideration of any Amendments to the Clause or Clauses in Committee. The Question on a Motion made by the Government to leave out any Clause or Clauses of the Bill shall be put forthwith by the Chairman or Speaker without debate. Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day, as provided by the Standing Order "Time for taking Private Business," be taken after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill or under this Order for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. On any day on which any proceedings are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, proceedings for that purpose under this Order shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. On an allotted day no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to re-commit the Bill, nor Motion for adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Government, and the Question on such Motion shall be put forthwith without any debate. Nothing in this Order shall—(a) prevent any business which under this Order is to be concluded on an allotted day being proceeded with on any other day, or necessitate any allotted day or part of an allotted day being given to any such business if the business to be concluded has been otherwise disposed of; or (b) prevent any other business being proceeded with on any allotted day or part of an allotted day in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House after the business to be proceeded with or concluded under this Order on the allotted day or part of the allotted day has been disposed of.

TABLE.

Committee Stage.

Allotted Day.	Proceedings.	Time for Proceedings to be brought to a Conclusion.
First - - -	Clause 1, the Committee stage of Financial Resolution - - -	10.30
Second - - -	Clause 2 - - - - - -	—
Third - - -	Clause 2 - - - - - -	7.30
	Report stage of Financial Resolution	10.30
Fourth - - -	Clause 3 - - - - - -	10.30
Fifth - - -	Clause 4 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clause 5 - - - - - -	10.30
Sixth - - -	Clauses 6 and 7 - - - -	7.30
	Clauses 8 and 9 - - - -	10.30
Seventh - - -	Clauses 10, 11, and 12 - - -	7.30
	New Clauses - - - - -	10.30
Eighth - - -	First Schedule - - - - -	7.30
	Remaining Schedules, and any other matter required to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion - -	10.30

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 30th November, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3.) Bill.—Leave given to the Select Committee to continue sitting in the absence of the Lord Monk Bretton.

Hastings Harbour Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments: Further Amendments made: Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3.) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Hylton be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Monk Bretton; read, and agreed to.

PETITIONS.

CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour of: Of the Wesleyan Methodists of Frogpool; St. Day; Stithians; Baldhu; Sunday School Teachers and Workers of the Gwennap Wesleyan Methodist Circuit. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (BUILDING GRANTS (APPROPRIATION ACTS, 1907 AND 1908, CIVIL SERVICES, CLASS IV., VOTE 1)).

Further statement showing the cases in which the Board of Education have received applications from local education authorities for special grants for the building of new public elementary schools, and the stage which each case had reached on 31st October, 1908.

NATAL.

Further correspondence relating to the trial of certain natives in Natal.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE ACTS.

Return giving, by counties and provinces, the area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase money of (*a*) land sold, and (*b*) lands in respect of which proceedings have been instituted and are pending for sale under the Irish Land Purchase Acts; also the estimated area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase-money of lands in respect of which proceedings for sale have not been instituted under the said Acts.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Two Orders, No. 7,605 and No. 7,606, dated 21st November, 1908, permitting the landing at the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf, of animals carried on board the ss. "Marquette" and "Minnehaha," respectively.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

Schemes for the regulation of hours of employment, intervals for meals and rest, and holidays of workers in charitable institutions approved by the Secretary of State, in pursuance of the powers conferred on him by Section 5 (2) (*a*) of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUNDAY LABOUR IN THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the prevalence of Sunday labour in the mercantile marine in so far as it applies to British ships when lying in port both at home and abroad; and to move that, in the opinion of this House, the subject warrants consideration at the hands of His Majesty's Government with a view to measures being taken towards ensuring that those serving on British ships shall, so far as is reasonably possible, be relieved from work on the Sabbath Day.

The question of Sunday labour and the necessity of one day's rest in seven is by no means new to this House, but so far as I am aware, with the exception of a few words that I said on this subject early in the session, when I was calling the attention of the House to the Return issued by the Government on the treatment of their merchant seamen by foreign countries, it has never been discussed in its particular relation to those who serve in our premier industry, the British mercantile marine. Whilst I am in sympathy with those who are labouring so earnestly in the direction of imposing limitations on Sunday labour in so far as it effects certain occupations ashore, I think it a duty to attempt to focus special attention upon the position of our merchant seafarers, to so many of whom rest on the Sabbath day is a thing that is very seldom known.

My Lords, I do not seek for the amelioration of the seafarers' lot in respect to the Sabbath in any unreasonable way. Though many do not seem to see it, we cannot make regulations for seafarers in the same way as we can for any profession or occupation ashore. It is a service which demands special consideration, and legislation which can be applied with perfect ease ashore might, if applied to shipping, do incalculable harm to all concerned. In the case of British merchant ships exceptional circumstances are apt to arise in port where Sunday work can reasonably be expected of their crews. In the interests of shipowners I would certainly make provision for these exceptional occasions, but in the interests of seafarers I would, did the matter rest in my hands, make provision so that those who do this additional work should receive additional pay for it.

Then, again, when British ships are on the high seas it would be absurd to suggest that everybody should be allowed to abandon work on the Sabbath Day. The ship must get along; therefore duty must continue, although, so far as I can gather, shipmasters always reduce the work to its lowest possible limits on Sundays when at sea. Having said that I ask for nothing but what is reasonable, I can, with perfect truth, assure your Lordships that Sunday labour on board merchant ships is rife, not only when they are lying in ports abroad but also in ports at home. Officers and seamen, particularly the officers, are worked to the utmost, and the blessing of one day's rest in seven is to them a rare privilege. I make no exceptions in classes or types of ships. In some of the biggest lines Sunday labour is just as common as Sunday labour in ships bearing the misnomer of "tramps." If it is not so when the ships are in ports at home, it is amply made up for when the ships go abroad.

Lord Muskerry.

In one of the biggest shipping lines in this country, whose headquarters are not 100 miles from this House, I may tell your Lordships that the ships always work on Sundays when in ports abroad. I will take another of our biggest lines, where a smart and promising young officer wrote, in a most courteous and reasonable way, to the directors of the company, pointing out what a very great physical strain it was on officers that they should be expected constantly to work on Sundays whilst the steamers were loading or discharging in Mediterranean ports. The response he got was that, on arrival home, he was requested to resign on the ground that he was not satisfied with the conditions of his employment. I would ask your Lordships whether we are right in tolerating this, and whether we should not protect our seafarers against such treatment? Have they no right to say anything on their own behalf? Take another big Atlantic Line. I am reliably informed that cargo is often worked on Sundays when the vessels are in a home port and also at ports abroad.

Coming to other firms, I find from the chief officer of a big steamer that—

> "Sunday labour is the rule and not the exception at home and abroad. There is no recognition of Sunday, so far as loading or discharging is concerned."

Another officer says—

> "The Eastern trade is a very hard one, day and night, Sundays included. No one ever knows what it is in his ship to have an hour off."

And he very rightly thinks that something to stop this state of affairs, so that an officer could get some time to himself, should be considered. Another officer says that abroad there is Sunday labour every Sunday if possible. During the last six months he has had eight Sundays in port, and worked on them all. I could quote you innumerable cases, but will content myself with giving you the opinions of one more gentleman following the sea. He is in command of a steamer and says—

> "Sunday labour abroad, I fear, will never be properly done away with, for this reason. The shipowners of England encourage it by paying dispatch money—that is, to stevedores, who, out of that money, of course, pay extra to their men who are working on Sunday."

He says that if Sunday labour were done away with, also the ways and means for saving Sunday at sea for owner's benefit, he is certain that seafarers would live longer and not have as many grey hairs in their heads.

I have in my possession the terms of a postscript appended to a letter of instructions which a certain large and well-known firm of shipowners forwarded to the master of one of their ships then lying in a port abroad. This postscript reads as follows—

> "You should arrange to scrape the ship's bottom on Sunday so as not to interfere with the work on ordinary days. I hope you have thought of this and got it done."

This emanates, not from any minor or unimportant shipping company, but from one which figures very prominently in shipping circles. I wonder what your Lordships think of this postscript. I ask: Are we going to permit such things to continue? Are we not going to do anything in lightening the lot of men who have such limited opportunities of speaking for themselves? Are we to allow officers and men, even under the broiling sun of West Africa, to be creatures of toil on Sunday just as on any other day?

Thanks to the Return which I was able to get from His Majesty's Government, shipowners cannot plead the stereotyped argument of contending against fierce foreign competition. From the Return I have mentioned, it is easy to see that most foreign maritime countries are far more solicitous about their seafarers than we are, even though we pride ourselves that the position is quite the opposite. Earlier in the session, when I was calling attention to this Return, I read to your Lordships extracts from it showing how the different foreign nations treated their sailors as far as regards Sunday work. I do not propose to take up time by again going through this, but in all the cases where there is absolute necessity for carrying on work on Sunday in every case the officers and crews receive extra remuneration. I think, my Lords, that anybody who studies the Return in question will realise that we are a long way behind other maritime countries so far as Sunday labour on board ship is concerned.

Apart from the Return, I can clearly put the position by relating the experiences of two gentlemen serving in different large steamers. One says—

> "*Re* Sunday work; lying here (at Ibicuy) last Sunday we were working, although there is no hurry for her, as we do not leave here for Santos until the end of October. I asked the contractor, who is building the wharf, if he worked his men on Sundays. His reply was: 'No, unless there is an English ship here, and then she pays all expenses.' He also remarked that most foreign ships would not work on Sundays."

The other gentleman, writing from an Italian port, gives his opinion in this way—

> "I thought that I would inform you about the altered conditions that prevail in Italy *re* Sunday labour. There is no Sunday labour now on board vessels in this port, and I can also vouch for Genoa and Civita Vecchia. Our broker informs me that it now applies to all Italian ports. One would hardly credit that where these things can be, and are, stopped in other countries, they are allowed to go on unchecked under British rule. In Alexandria, last voyage, we worked both Sundays that we were there, as every other British vessel does, as it counts one half-day to the ship, providing they work a full day."

I propose to trouble your Lordships but little more in regard to this serious matter. But I would emphasise the fact that under ordinary conditions when at sea our seamen and firemen must work twelve hours per day, Saturdays and Sundays included. In the great majority of cases our merchant officers must work, roughly speaking, some fifteen hours per day. Surely, then, when they do reach port and Sunday comes round they have an undeniable right to that rest and relaxation which they so richly deserve and most certainly require, and which at the present time they certainly do not get.

I am glad to say that there are some shipowning firms who set their faces against Sunday work on their ships. These firms deserve great praise, though I do not suppose they seek it. If only in justice to them, their colleagues should be forced to fall into line with them and be prevented from offering unscrupulous opposition both in the way of forcing their men to work on Sundays and in other despicable ways. It is no use appealing to conscience. Nothing will do it but compulsion, and that is why I hope this Motion will meet with the complete and unanimous approval of the House. It would be useless to introduce a Bill at the present time, but a consensus of opinion such as that which I now hope for would carry enormous weight, and would considerably facilitate our seeing the matter through to the end.

There are two aspects to the question. One is the religious aspect, which I will not dwell upon, simply because I think that when we urge the proper observance of the Sabbath we should, in the first place, demand that people should be given the opportunity of observing it properly. In the remarkable "Message to the Nation" which was issued not very long ago by the heads of the three Churches in this country I was very glad indeed to see that, whilst the proper observance of the Sabbath Day was very naturally dwelt upon, the physical necessity of one day's rest in seven was also fully recognised. At the recent International Congress on the Lord's Day held at Edinburgh, Mr. Moore, secretary of the Imperial Merchant Service Guild, speaking as the only representative of seafarers present, said—

> "The amount of Sunday labour in the merchant service is a grave national scandal."

The Guild have especially brought this subject to my notice, and it is one which I can honestly say I have never more gladly taken up. It represents an evil which, sooner or later, must be eradicated. I can only commend my Motion for your earnest consideration, and should your Lordships see your way clear to give it your support, it would, I can fully assure you, be received with feelings of deep appreciation and gratitude by those who serve in the mercantile marine of our country.

Moved, "That the prevalence of Sunday labour in the mercantile marine, in so far as it relates to British ships when lying in port both at home and abroad, warrants consideration at the hands of His Majesty's Government with a view to measures being taken towards ensuring that those serving on British ships shall, so far as is reasonably possible, be relieved from work on the Sabbath Day."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I am sure your Lordships will agree that the subject to which the noble Lord has called attention warrants consideration, not only at the hands of His Majesty's Government, but by everyone in this House. It largely depends, of course, on the way in which Sunday labour is construed. I have seen it on the West Coast of Africa, and the circumstances there make Sunday labour very often essential. But it is not universally essential. The noble Lord mentioned a great many cases, and we should like to have heard the names of some of the steamship companies concerned, especially the one which ordered the scraping of the ship on Sunday. I think it is perfectly outrageous to ask men who have been working all the week to set to work on Sunday and scrape the ship. Sunday labour is absolutely necessary in that part of the Empire to which I have referred. The Resolution, however, is worded in so mild a manner that there would be no harm in voting for it. We should like to hear what His Majesty's Government have to say on the matter.

THE EARL OF MEATH: My Lords, it is perfectly true, as Lord Mayo has said, that there are portions of the Empire where Sunday labour is necessary in regard to shipping; but, from personal knowledge, I know that the noble Lord who has brought forward this Motion is absolutely right when he says that there are large portions of the Empire, especially in the Mediterranean, where it is quite unnecessary that labour should go on on the Sunday. I hope that His Majesty's Government are going to answer the noble Lord in a sympathetic manner. It would be very remarkable if this country, which has always shown itself especially anxious that the Sabbath should be a day of rest, were to lag behind the rest of the world in this matter. I am no fanatic with regard to the observance of the Sunday. If it is necessary that work should go on, I say let it go on; but it is wrong for any body of employers to make their men work on Sunday when it is not necessary. First of all, there are a large number of men who object to Sunday work for honest religious reasons, and you have no right to force these men to work on the Sunday if they feel that it is contrary to their religious convictions. Then there is a very large number who feel that if they were on land they would not have to work on Sunday, and, therefore, they are aggrieved. This is not so much a grievance on the part of seamen, who often get extra pay; but the officers get no extra pay at all, and, from my own personal knowledge, work sometimes for fourteen and fifteen hours a day. Even in port they get no rest, and it stands to reason that if men are working always at high pressure they cannot be as capable of doing their duty as those who get a certain amount of rest. I believe myself that a good many accidents in connection with ships are due to overwork, and, therefore, from the utilitarian point of view, putting the religious view entirely outside, I hope that His Majesty's Government will give this question their serious attention.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL: My Lords, I do not intend to occupy your Lordships' time for more than a minute, but as I work in one of our largest seaports I desire, with all my heart, to support the Motion before the House. I do so on the ground that British seamen in port have just as much right to Sunday rest as we who work on land. I think it is a curious anomaly that nations which are supposed not to regard Sunday with any great degree of reverence should have safeguarded Sunday rest for their sailors, while we, who are supposed to be a Sunday-loving people, take no measures whatever to prevent, as far as is reasonably possible, those serving on British ships from working on Sunday. There is undoubtedly a grievance, and any Government that will take this case in hand will earn the gratitude of a class of men through whose craft we derive as a nation a great part of our wealth.

LORD LYVEDEN: My Lords, I should like to say, as regards the Motion moved by Lord Muskerry, that I fear it will not work at all smoothly. These things cannot be done by legislation, and should really be left to the discretion of the captains. Take, for instance, ships lying in open roadsteads like Jaffa. A ship may have to lie off there for several days owing to the weather. Suddenly a calm comes, and then, of course, it is a case of "all hands." It would be very hard if the day on which the calm came happened to be a Sunday and the officers and men refused to work owing to this legislation. I hope, therefore, my noble friend will not press the Motion, but will leave it to the discretion of the captains.

THE LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR: My Lords, I rise to give my support to Lord Muskerry's Motion. I do not think the noble Lord would deprecate men working on Sunday when it was necessary, such as in an open roadstead where it would be dangerous to lose any opportunity, or on the coast of Africa. But is it not something of a national scandal that in ports where there is no such necessity for Sunday work the men on British ships should be required to work whilst those on ships belonging to foreign Powers which do not profess to reverence the Sunday as we do abstain from work. In the Return to which Lord Muskerry has referred instances are given of that. I therefore hope your Lordships will accept the Motion.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, I wish to commence what I have to say to-night by a sort of protest which I have had for some time in my mind. I do not know whether your Lordships have noticed that there is an extraordinary family likeness between the Notices of Motion which the noble Lord is in the habit of putting on the Paper. The general proposition which the noble Lord brings forward is always a very excellent one, but the particular application which he wishes to make of that principle is always difficult and very often impossible. The presence of those two features on these occasions places the noble Lord in a very enviable position, and it places the person who has to return the matter-of-fact official answer in rather a difficult one. I see that the noble Lord nods his head; he evidently appreciates that fact, and I can assure him that I do. What happens is that the noble Lord is able to pose as the champion of everything which is noble and ideal, and the official mouthpiece is made to appear as the advocate of all that is base and uncharitable. Your Lordships may have noticed that of late a third character has appeared in these scenes, in the shape of the noble Earl on the cross benches, whose role, if I may say so, is to rub in that particular aspect of the case.

THE EARL OF MEATH: Hear, hear.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: I do not really complain of that, because I suppose it is all part of the game, and that in time one will get accustomed to it. But I myself have invariably found that I am in agreement with the noble Lord on the general principle of his Motion. It is only when one comes to look into the matter more closely that one finds the enormous difficulty of applying it to the particular case brought forward. That has very frequently been so, and it is very much the case on this occasion. I am sure the Government and every Member of your Lordships' House would be willing to support any reasonable legislation for minimising Sunday labour, either ashore or afloat; but the difficulties in connection with this question when applied to shipping are, as has been pointed out, very large indeed. If the noble Lord could show what is at present by no means certain, that it is really desired by those who engage in this labour that there should be legislation on the subject, and if he could also show us some practical way of carrying out that object, I can assure him that the matter would have the most careful and most minute attention at the hands of the Department which I represent. I should like to call attention to one point in connection with this. It is not two years since the last Merchant Shipping Act was under consideration in this House. I was present throughout those debates, and I have since refreshed my memory by reading what took place, and I cannot find among all the mass of Amendments which the noble Lord placed on the Paper a single one which dealt with this point. If the matter was so urgent that was surely the time to deal with it; and as the noble Lord did not bring it forward then, I do not think he can blame His Majesty's Government for not having dealt with it since. What I understand with regard to Sunday labour is that it is made a matter of agreement between the employers and the seamen at the time of their engagement.

LORD MUSKERRY: No.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZIEL: Well, that is my information; and, as a rule, those articles of agreement contain a stipulation that in case Sunday labour is found necessary a stated rate of extra pay, usually 6d. or 8d. an hour shall be allowed to the men.

THE EARL OF MEATH: What about the officers?

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: I understand that a similar arrangement is the rule with regard to the officers. I do not say that it is universal, but I am informed that a similar arrangement is the rule, though, of course, the scale of extra remuneration in those cases is higher. We have had no fresh evidence before us since I answered the question put by the noble Lord in June last; and in the circumstances I am sorry to say I cannot return him any different answer. I hope, therefore, he will not press the Motion. But, as I say, if the noble Lord can produce any concrete or practical method of dealing with the matter we shall be only too happy to consider it.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: My Lords, I think everyone of your Lordships must sympathise in principle with what I understand Lord Muskerry desires to impress upon the House and the country—namely, that Sunday labour in the case of the crews of British merchant ships should be avoided as far as possible. But I am afraid that I must add to that that I sympathise also a great deal with what has just fallen from the noble Lord who represents the Board of Trade. I was myself for four years

President of the Board of Trade, and while my noble friend behind me and the subsequent speakers were impressing upon the House their objections to Sunday labour I was thinking how, if I had been President of the Board of Trade now, I should have proposed to Parliament to deal with it. I confess I see no way whatever. One thing is quite certain, that on board ship much more than on land it is necessary sometimes that Sunday labour should be done. There may be cases frequently, such as those referred to, where it is absolutely necessary, in the interest of the safety of the ship and of the work being properly done which the ship is sent out to do, that there should be Sunday labour. Therefore, I am sure Lord Muskerry would not propose that a law should be passed that no Sunday labour beyond the ordinary work of the ship should be done by the officers and crew. But if my noble friend would not propose that, what could he propose? All I can see is that the Board of Trade should endeavour, by any suggestions they can make to the parties concerned, to check Sunday labour as far as possible by requiring that where it is demanded extra pay should be given for it. I do not think it is really practicable to do more than that, and therefore, I hope my noble friend will not press this matter to a division.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, in reference to what has just been said by the noble Viscount, I would point out that all the Mediterranean ports are perfectly safe. There is absolutely no necessity for Sunday labour there; yet Sunday labour does go on there on British ships though not on foreign ships. Then I come to the suggestion made by Lord Lyveden about leaving the matter to the discretion of the captains. If a captain exercised his discretion and stopped Sunday labour he would be told on his return that there was no further need for his services. That is well known. As to what Lord Hamilton said about extra payment, I have heard on occasions of members of the crew being paid extra for Sundays, but I have never heard—and, as your Lordships know, I am in the way of hearing these things—that an officer has ever received a farthing extra pay for Sunday labour or overtime. The noble Lord who represents the Board of Trade suggested that I should bring forward some proposal for remedying this matter. I think His Majesty's Government should bring it forward. I am not asking for anything unreasonable. Sunday work is going on in the docks at Liverpool, London, and all over the kingdom. Is that necessary? I say it is not; and I shall, therefore, press my Motion to a division.

On Question,

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 22; Not Contents, 47.

CONTENTS.

Newcastle, D.

Carlisle, E.
Mayo, E.
Westmeath, E.

Cross, V.

Hill, V

Bangor, L. Bp.
Liverpool, L. Bp.
Southwark, L. Bp.

Ampthill, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armitstead, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*) [*Teller.*]

Clonbrock, L.
Courtney of Penwith, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Langford, L.
Mendip, L. (*V. Clifden.*)
Muskerry, L. [*Teller.*]
Newton, L.
Stanmore, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Lansdowne, M.

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Cadogan, E.
Cathcart, E.
Cromer, E.
Kimberley, E.

Lauderdale, E.
Liverpool, E.
Lovelace, E.
Mansfield, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Onslow, E.
Russell, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)

Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
St. Aldwyn, V.

Ashbourne, L.
Balfour, L.
Braye, L.

Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam.*)
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Cloncurry, L.
Colebrooke, L. [*Teller.*]
De Mauley, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Farrer, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Grenfell, L.
Grey de Ruthyn, L.
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Herschell, L. [*Teller.*]
Hindlip, L.
Hylton, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lyveden, L.
Monkswell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Pirrie, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Ribblesdale, L.
St, Davids, L.
Sanderson, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)

CHILDREN BILL.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^{a}."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill read 3^{a}.

THE LORD STEWARD (Earl BEAUCHAMP) explained that his first Amendment was of a temporary character, and applied to those children who had been put out to nurse before the passing of this Bill.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 31, after the word 'thereunder,' to insert the words 'Subject as aforesaid, this part of this Act shall apply to an infant whose nursing and maintenance has been undertaken for reward before the passing of this Act, in like manner as it applies to an infant whose nursing and maintenance has been so undertaken after the commencement of this Act, and as if any notice given under the Infant Life Protection Act, 1897, had been a notice given under this part of this Act.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Verbal Amendment to Clause 3 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend subsection (2) of Clause 17—

"(2) For the purposes of this section a person shall be deemed to have caused or encouraged the seduction or prostitution (as the case may be) of a girl who has been seduced or become a prostitute if he has knowingly allowed the girl to consort with, or to enter or continue in the employment of, any prostitute or person of notoriously immoral character,"

by omitting the word "notoriously" and inserting the word "known." He said the Amendment had been submitted to, and approved by, the Lord Chief Justice.

Amendment moved—

"In page 11, line 6, to leave out the word 'notoriously,' and to insert the word 'known.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE was advised that "notoriously" was the word wanted, as it meant generally known, whereas "known" would mean known to nobody in particular. But as the Lord Chief Justice had approved of the Amendment he would not press his objection.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said his proposed new subsection to Clause 38 was chiefly of the character of his first Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 23, line 14, after the word 'person,' to insert the following new subsection: '(3) This part of this Act shall apply in the case of a child or young person who has before the commencement of this Act been committed to the care of a relative or other fit person by an order made under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904, as if the order had been made under this part of this Act.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend subsection (3) of Clause 58—

"(3) Where a child, apparently of the age of twelve or thirteen years, who has not previously been convicted, is charged before a Court of summary jurisdiction with an offence punishable in the case of an adult by penal servitude or a less punishment, and the Court is satisfied that the child should be sent to a certified school but, having regard to the special circumstances of the case, should not be sent to a certified reformatory school, and is also satisfied that the character and antecedents of the child are such that he will not exercise an evil influence over the other children in a certified industrial school, the Court may order the child to be sent to a certified industrial school, having previously ascertained that the managers are willing to receive the child,"

by leaving out the words "Court of summary jurisdiction" and inserting the words "Petty Sessional Court." He reminded the House that their Lordships had decided, in Committee, that Courts of summary jurisdiction unless they were Petty Sessional Courts should not have jurisdiction to order a child to be sent to an industrial school.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 30, line 29, to leave out the words 'Court of summary jurisdiction,' and to insert the words 'Petty Sessional Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved a number of drafting Amendments to Clause 74, the object of which was, he explained, to transpose the definition of Local authority from subsection (5) to subsection (7). It was thought to be more convenient that it should appear there than in the fifth subsection.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 74 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend subsection (10) of the same clause—

> "(10) The local authority responsible for the maintenance of a youthful offender or child in a certified school under this section shall be responsible for his maintenance in the school in which he is for the time being detained, notwithstanding that having been originally ordered to be sent to a reformatory school he is subsequently transferred to an industrial school or having been originally ordered to be sent to an industrial school he is subsequently transferred to or ordered by a Court to be sent to a reformatory school—"

by omitting the words "in the school in which he is for the time being detained" and inserting the words "in the event of his transfer to another certified school." This subsection was only intended to cover those cases where a youthful offender or a child, having been sent to one school, was afterwards transferred to another. Their Lordships would see that the words in the subsection as it at present stood were open to a wider construction.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 43, lines 17 and 18, to leave out the words 'in the school in which he is for the time being detained,' and to insert the words 'in the event of his transfer to another certified school.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 92 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend the provision in Clause 105, that—

> "A child or young person in detention pursuant to the directions of the Secretary of State may, at any time, be discharged by the Secretary of State on licence—"

by deleting the words "child or young." As this clause dealt with cases of prolonged detention of a child who had been guilty, perhaps, of some serious offence, the child when released would be a great deal over sixteen years of age. It was, therefore, desirable to amend the provision in the manner proposed.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 59, line 25, to leave out the words 'child or young.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the meaning of the new subsection which he proposed to insert in Clause 111 was clear upon the face of it. It was thought that there might be places which might not be able to make the necessary arrangements before the Act came into force, and this subsection would enable the Secretary of State to postpone the coming into operation of this section as regards those places. He could give the House a pledge, on behalf of the Secretary of State, that he would not use the power further than was absolutely necessary.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 65, line 2, after the word 'Treasury,' to insert the following new subsection: "(6) Where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that arrangements cannot be made for the purpose of complying with this section in any place by the first day of April, nineteen hundred and nine, the Secretary of State may by order postpone the coming into operation of this section as respects that place until such date, not later than the first day of January, nineteen hundred and ten, as may be specified in the order.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to

Drafting Amendments to Clause 114 agreed to.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved to strike out of subsection (2) of Clause 118—

> "(2) Any constable who finds a person wandering from place to place and taking a child with him may, if he has reasonable ground for believing that the person is guilty of an offence under this section, apprehend him without a warrant, and may take the child to a place of safety in accordance with the provisions of Part II. of this Act—"

the power there given to a constable to apprehend an offender under the clause without a warrant. He urged that the clause proposed to establish a very far-reaching procedure. He could not see why it should be necessary to arrest the father, but the clause gave a policeman power, not only to take charge of the child with a view to its proper education, but also to arrest the father and lock him up. It was not a criminal offence to fail to send a child to school, and in his opinion the power given to arrest the father went far beyond the necessities of the case.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 66, line 33, to leave out the words 'apprehend him without a warrant, and may.'" (*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

THE EARL OF ONSLOW said that those who lived amid the arid heaths and waste lands of Surrey and Sussex knew how impossible it was to get hold of a gypsy. They were here to-day and gone to-morrow, and he felt sure he would be supported by the chief constables when he said that these people were the source of a great deal of the crime in those counties. If power to arrest without a warrant were not taken, the police would never be able to get hold of these men and their children. If the Amendment were agreed to the clause would be rendered nugatory so far as vagrants were concerned. He quite agreed that this was a new departure, but they had to deal with a very peculiar class in these nomads, who were commonly known as gypsies, but had not much of the old glamour that surrounded gypsy tribes. They were, for the most part, loafers and vagrants from the great towns, and more particularly from London. He hoped their Lordships would be content with the modification of the clause about to be proposed by the Lord Steward, which would relieve those who were engaged in a trade or business during certain parts of the year.

EARL BEAUCHAMP also argued that the Amendment would make the clause of no effect. One of the objects in arresting the father was to make him pay. If he got away, there was no power to make him pay.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved the insertion of a new subsection, which he said was the outcome of the promise given to Earl Russell by the Lord Privy Seal at an earlier stage that the matter to which the noble Earl called attention should be considered.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 66, line 36, after the word 'Part,' to insert the following new subsection: '(3) Without prejudice to the requirements of the Education Acts, 1870 to 1907, as to school attendance or to proceedings thereunder, this section shall not apply during the months of April to September, inclusive, to any child whose parent or guardian is engaged in a trade of such a nature as to require him to travel from place to place, and who has obtained a certificate of having made not less than two hundred attendances at a public elementary school during the months of October to March immediately preceding, and the power of the Board of Education to make regulations with respect to the issue of certificates of due attendance for the purposes of the Education Acts, 1870 to 1907, shall include a power to make regulations as to the issue of certificates of attendance for the purposes of this section.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

EARL RUSSELL expressed the gratitude of those for whom he was acting to the Government for drafting the new subsection, which entirely met his particular opinion. He moved, however, to amend the Amendment by inserting the words, "or business" after the word, "trade." The expression "trade" might possibly be taken to mean some specified or particular trade recognised by a trade union.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

> "After the word 'trade' to insert the words 'or business.'"—(*Earl Russell.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE asked the noble Earl in charge of the Bill whether he was satisfied that the words as now drafted covered the case of a tinker who was travelling about the country looking for business. Such a man could not be said to be at the moment actually engaged in a trade or business.

EARL BEAUCHAMP thought that such a case would be covered. The Home Office, however, would consider the point, and, if necessary, the wording could be amended in the other House.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

LORD MONKSWELL next moved a new clause, which, he said, was simply a transfer of Clause 21 of the defunct Licensing Bill to this Bill. He believed the principle had the assent of every Member of their Lordships' House, and, therefore, it was unnecessary to say anything on the merits.

Amendments moved—

"In page 66, after Clause 119, to insert the following new clause: '(1) The holder of the licence of any licensed premises shall not allow a child to be at any time in the bar of the licensed premises, except during the hours of closing. (2) If the holder of a licence acts in contravention of this section, or if any person causes or procures, or attempts to cause or procure, any child to go to or to be in the bar of any licensed premises except during the hours of closing, he shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding, in respect of the first offence, forty shillings, and in respect of any subsequent offence, five pounds. (3) If a child is found in the bar of any licensed premises, except during the hours of closing, the holder of the licence shall be deemed to have committed an offence under this section unless he shows that he has used due diligence to prevent the child being admitted to the bar. (4) Where any person is charged with an offence under this section in respect of a child who is alleged in the charge to be under the age of fourteen, and the child appears to the Court to be under that age, the child shall be deemed to be under that age unless the contrary is shown. (5) Nothing in this section shall apply in the case of a child who is resident but not employed in the licensed premises or in the case of premises constructed, fitted, and intended to be used in good faith for any purpose to which the holding of a licence is merely auxiliary. (6) In this section the bar of licensed premises means any open drinking bar or any part of the premises exclusively or mainly used for the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquor."—(*Lord Monkswell*).

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend the proposed new clause by omitting subsection (4), the point as to age being already provided for in the Bill, and inserting, as the final subsection, a provision that the expressions "licence" and "licensed premises" had the same meaning as in the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To leave out subsection (4), and to insert the following new subsection: '(7) The expressions "licence" and "licensed premises" have the same meaning as in the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp*.)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to leave out the words "Before making any order under this Act with respect to," at the beginning of Clause 122, and to insert other words. He explained that the object of this and the three following Amendments was to make it quite clear that sentences under Clauses 103 and 104 were not to be invalidated by subsequent proof that the child on whom the sentence was passed was not really a child or young person—that was to say, if a mistake had been made in the age the sentence should still be held to be valid.

Amendment moved—

"In page 69, lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'Before making any order under this Act with respect to,' and to insert the words 'Where a person is brought before any Court, whether charged with an offence or not, and it appears to the Court that he is.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp*.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 128 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP explained that a gap had been left in Clause 130 in the definitions of "police authority" and "police fund," the Police Act of 1890 not applying to the City of London. The Amendment was drafted to supply that deficiency.

Amendment moved—

"In page 72, line 22, after the word 'fund,' to insert the words 'as respects the City of London, mean the Common Council and the fund out of which the expenses of the City police are defrayed, and elsewhere.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved an Amendment in Clause 131 consequential upon the new clause which had been inserted on the Motion of Lord Monkswell, the object being to give the proper references to the Scottish Licensing Acts.

Amendment moved—

"In page 75, line 34, after the word '1864,' to insert the words 'and the reference to the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906, as a reference to the Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903, provided that the expression "holder of a licence" means holder of a certificate under the last-mentioned Act.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved to amend subsection (17) of Clause 132—

"(17) The provisions relating to exemptions from Part I. of this Act shall include any religious or charitable society which shall pay any person for keeping an infant, or any person so employed, provided that such society shall have obtained from the Local Government Board a certificate that it is a fit and proper institution to be exempted from the provisions of that part of this Act,"

by leaving out all the words after "The provisions relating to exemptions from Part 1 of this Act shall" and inserting the words in his Amendment which had been suggested to him by the Irish Office as better than those which their Lordships had been good enough to insert, on his Motion, at an earlier stage.

Amendment moved—

"In page 81, line 16, to leave out from the word 'shall' to the end of the subsection, and to insert the words 'extend to any person who undertakes for reward the nursing and maintenance of such infants only as are boarded-out with him by some religious or charitable society or institution approved by the Local Government Board for Ireland.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Privilege Amendments agreed to.

Moved "That the Bill do now pass." (*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill passed, and returned to the Commons, and to be printed as amended. [No. 233.]

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 30th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Hastings Harbour Bill.—As amended, considered.

Ordered, "That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

King's Consent signified.—Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Wednesday.

PETITIONS.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Petition from Plymouth, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

TILONKO.

Petition of Tilonko, a Chief of the Embo tribe of Zulus, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATAL.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to the Trial of certain Natives in Natal [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (SCHEMES FOR REGULATION OF HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT, ETC., IN CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS).

Copy presented, of Schemes for the Regulation of Hours of Employment, intervals, and holidays of workers in Charitable Institutions, approved by the Secretary of State in pursuance of the powers conferred on him by the Factory and Workshop Act, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of an Order, No. 7605, dated 21st November, 1908, permitting the landing at Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the s.s. "Marquetto" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of an Order, No. 7606, dated 21st November, 1908, permitting the landing at the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the s.s. "Minnehaha" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POOR RELIEF (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd July; *Mr. Masterman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 340.]

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy presented, of the Annual Local Taxation Returns for 1906–7. Part II. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 333.]

IRISH LAND PURCHASE ACTS.

Copy presented, of Return giving by Counties and Provinces the area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase money of: (*a*) Lands sold; and (*b*) lands in respect of which proceedings have been instituted and are pending for sale under the Irish Land Purchase Acts; also the estimated area, Poor Law valuation, and purchase money of lands in respect of which proceedings for sale have not been instituted under the said Acts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Old-Age Pensions Regulation.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a man and his wife, whose joint income amounts to £27 3s. 2d. per annum are entitled to the full pension, the income being derived as follows: Miners' Permanent Relief Fund £12 9s. 2d., friendly society, £5 4s., interest on money invested £3, allowed for free house £6 10s., both applicants being over seventy years of age.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) If the whole income belonged to the husband he would be entitled to a pension of 2s. If less than the whole he would be entitled to from 2s. to 5s., according to the amount of his income. The wife (provided that the part, if any, of the joint income which was her exclusive property did not exceed £21 a year) would be entitled to a pension of 5s.

Extra Police in County Galway.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how the extra police at present stationed in County Galway are distributed; and the reasons in each case for the continued retention of these men in each district.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The present distribution of the extra force in the County of Galway is as follows, viz.—

—	Head Constables.	Sergeants and Constables.
Athenry Constabulary District	1	57
Ballinasloe ” ”	—	39
Loughrea ” ”	—	60
Mountbellew ” ”	—	39
Portumna ” ”	—	8
Woodford ” ”	—	17
Clifden ” ”	—	3
Dumnore ” ”	—	25
Galway ” ”	—	20
Gort ” ”	—	45
Oughterard ” ”	—	3
Tuam ” ”	—	29
Total	1	345

The extra force in each of the districts with the exception of Oughterard, is required to prevent cattle-driving and forms of disorder arising therefrom, to protect certain persons who require protection, and generally to preserve the peace. The three police in Oughterard district are required for emergencies elsewhere in the West Riding, but are lodged in that district because there is no room to house them in other districts.

Irish Land Stock.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, under the new Irish Land Bill, it is proposed that vendors under agreements lodged before 1st November should have the option of taking, in lieu of cash, either Two and three-quarters per cent. Guaranteed Stock at a minimum of 92, on the lines proposed by the Departmental Committee of the Treasury, or the proposed new Three per cent. Stock at its face value; and whether vendors subsequent to 1st November will have any option or will be compelled to accept payment in Three per cent. Stock only.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I would refer the noble Lord to Clauses 3 (2) and 3 (3) of the Bill which has just been issued.

Restoration of the Sigginshaggard Evicted Tenants.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Sigginshaggard evicted tenants belonging to the Carew estate, who were evicted about 1886, have not yet been restored to their homes, although the estate was sold some time ago; and whether, as neither landlord nor anybody else objects to their restoration, he can say what is the cause of the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) This estate has not yet been sold to the Estates Commissioners, but the owner informed the Commissioners on the 12th instant that he was prepared to accept the prices estimated by them for the evicted farms. The evicted tenants will, it is hoped, be reinstated at an early date.

Land for Evicted Tenants on the Douglas Estate.

MR. J. PHILLIPS (Longford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Estates Commissioners are about to acquire compulsorily for the benefit of the evicted tenants about 400 acres of land on the Douglas estate, County Longford; whether, with a view to fixing the price, an inspector visited and inspected these lands only last week; whether within the last few days a local grazier's son named Harris Martin has stepped in and become tenant of part of the lands about to be so acquired; and, if so, will he, in the interest of the peace of the district, request the Estates Commissioners to expedite the negotiations and clear out the new occupier.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am making inquiries as to the case, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Share of Bog Land on Irish Estates.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps have been taken by the Estates Commissioners on estates where sales are completed and the lands vested in the tenants to secure that labourers having houses and plots of their own, or labourers living in district council cottages on those estates, get portions of the common bog in each of those estates; and whether, to secure that those labourers shall in future get turf on the bog of the estate in which their houses are situate, he will request the Estates Commissioners to issue a new rule, insisting that all labourers shall get a share of the common bog on each estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Where an advance is made to trustees under Section 4 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, for the purchase of land containing turbary, the land is vested in the trustees subject to a scheme framed in accordance with Section 20 of the Act. Under such schemes the trustees have power, when the reasonable requirements of the purchasing tenants have been provided for, to permit other persons in the neighbourhood to cut turf on the land on such conditions as to payment as the trustees may prescribe. The case of the sale of an estate where portion of the holding consists of bog, on which the purchaser had not an exclusive right of turbary, is provided for by Section 21 of the Act of 1903, as amended by Section 24 of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1906. No alteration in the existing practice appears to be necessary.

Administration of Tubrid School, County Fermanagh.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the alleged maladministration of the charity known as the Tubrid School, situated in County Fermanagh, Ireland, by the rector of the parish and the body known as the governors; is he aware that there exists considerable excitement in the county and neighbourhood at the treatment said to have been given to the boys under the trust; is he aware of the public desire that an efficient inquiry should be appointed to investigate the manner in which this charity has been administered; and whether he proposes to institute such an inquiry.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The institution referred to appears to be that known as Vaughan's Charitable School. I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by my right hon. friend the Attorney-General for Ireland to a Question on the subject asked by the hon. Member for the St. Patrick's division on the 23rd instant.

Irish Land Purchase Prices.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state, in the case where the selling landlord under the Land Purchase Act, 1903, has been paid his agreed price, and where the tenant purchaser, owing to delay in getting his vesting order, continues to pay the Land Commissioner 3½ per cent. on the agreed price, what becomes of the extra ¼ per cent. paid by the tenant purchaser sometimes for months; does it go to facilitate land purchase, does the Treasury benefit, or is it placed to the credit of the tenant purchaser.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I understand the hon. Member to refer to cases in which the Land Commission purchase estates under Section 6 or 7 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, for resale. In such cases Section 18 of the Act provides that the interest payable to the Land Commission under Section 35 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896, shall be at the rate of not less than 3½ per cent. per annum. Estates so purchased frequently include a considerable extent of untenanted land which may have to be held by the Commissioners before distribution for some time after the vendor has been paid his agreed price. This involves expenses of management and the payment of local rates and taxes. The ¼ per cent. referred to in the Question is required for these payments, and also for a working balance to meet the claims of the National Debt Commissioners which, if not met when due, would have to be advanced out of the Guarantee Fund. The Treasury does not benefit.

Police Protection of Mr. Lewis, of County Galway.

Mr. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number and cost of the extra police employed as a protection force for Mr. Lewis, County Galway; and whether he can give any reason why such expenditure should be continued.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Five extra police are employed for the protection of the Messrs. Lewis and their property. Their pay amounts to £286 per annum. It is hoped that the matter which necessitated the employment of this extra force will shortly be settled, and that it will be possible to withdraw the police.

Eviction of Mr. Walsh, of Kilmurry, County Kerry.

Mr. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state by whose authority a force of police accompanied the Under-Sheriff of the County of Kerry to evict Mr. Richard J. Walsh, of Kilmurry, Castleisland, County Kerry, recently, when it was a matter of public notoriety that Mr. Walsh's mother, an old woman of eighty years, was unfit for removal, and considerable expense to the public funds thereby incurred.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police force attended upon the requisition of the sheriff. The authorities are bound to afford sufficient protection in such cases. The sheriff declined to act on the rumour that Mrs. Walsh was ill and unable to be moved, but he took a doctor to examine the sick woman, and, upon his certificate, further proceedings were abandoned.

Bonus on Irish Land Purchase Agreements.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the case that since the publication of the new Treasury Regulations any further purchase agreements will be subject to the fact that only a bonus of 3 per cent. will be available unless and until the new Irish Land Bill is passed into law; and can he say whether in any future agreements, pending the passing of fresh legislation, tenant purchasers will have to pay the increased interest of 3 per cent. now proposed, or will they only be liable for payment of the old rate of 2¾ per cent.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Answer to the second part is that, pending the passing of fresh legislation, there is no power to make the rate of interest 3 per cent. or any rate different from the old rate of 2¾ per cent.

Kneller Hall Training for Army Musicians attached to Regiments serving Abroad.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it would be possible to make arrangements for promising musicians serving with battalions out of the United Kingdom to have the advantage of training at the Kneller Hall School of Military Music; is he aware that musicians with regiments abroad are in many cases during all or almost all their term of service deprived of this advantage where they join a corps just going or that has recently gone on foreign service or that is sent on foreign service soon after they join; and is he aware that in many cases the men would be willing to contribute to any extra cost involved in their going home for some musical training.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) In making selections of soldiers for training as bandsmen at Kneller Hall the claims of those belonging to units serving abroad are not overlooked, and, at the present time, more than one-fourth of the total number under training belong to such units. In the case of boys enlisting at home for the band of a unit serving abroad endeavours are made to have them trained at Kneller Hall before they are sent abroad. Bandsmen serving abroad, on completing six years service abroad, can, if they have nine years total service, apply to be sent to the home battalion, and their places are then filled by bandsmen from home who have probably undergone a course at the school. During the past year forty-three men belonging to units abroad have been trained at the school.

Official Board of Arbitration.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Government will take into immediate consideration the advisability of conferring with the Labour Members respecting the establishment of an official Board of Arbitration upon the principles already in operation in certain British Colonies and Continental countries, with a view to the amicable settlement of trade disputes.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) In view of the great variety of principles on which Foreign and Colonial Arbitration Acts are based, I am not quite clear as to the particular principles to which the hon. Member refers, but I would remind him that I have recently set up a standing Court of Arbitration with a view to giving better effect to the intention of the Conciliation Act. He will find particulars of the scheme in the Memorandum which I have caused to be forwarded to him. I propose to await experience of this scheme before considering other proposals.

Hours of Drivers and Firemen on Midland Great Western Railway.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that drivers and firemen working His Majesty's mail on the Midland Great Western lines are working twelve hours per day, and that the nine hours of duty is systematic instead of being used in cases of urgency; whether he is aware that ballast drivers, firemen, and guards are working twelve, fourteen, and sometimes sixteen hours per day for five days of the week and then get a day off to make the total number of hours for the week look small; and whether he can state what is the delay in appointing the conciliation boards on the Midland Great Western line.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) As regards hours of duty the Board have received a letter from the company, of which I am forwarding a copy to the hon. Member. The explanations given therein will be carefully examined. Details of a scheme of conciliation boards for this railway have been arranged, and the company state that circulars and nomination papers will be issued to the staff with as little delay as possible.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that several railway companies in Ireland have lodging houses or barracks for their drivers, firemen, and guards when booked away from home; whether he can state if these men get proper rest, as the nature of their duties are onerous; whether he will state what steps are taken to see that these lodging-houses or barracks are in proper sanitary condition; and whether he is aware that these lodging houses or barracks are sometimes situate in the precincts of busy shunting yards, where operations are carried on day and night.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The sanitary condition of the lodging-houses or barracks referred to is not a matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Trade, but if the hon. Member furnishes me with specific instances in which it is affirmed that owing to the situation of the houses the men occupying them are unable to obtain proper rest, I will carefully consider whether representations on the subject can usefully be made to the railway company or companies concerned.

American Gooseberry Mildew Fungicides.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he can give a complete list of the names of the fungicides in use against American gooseberry mildew on which the Board have been consulted by local authorities, and which the Board have declared to be efficient; and whether the Board will publish regularly the names of such approved fungicides, as is done in the case of sheep-dips.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The preparations on which the Board have been consulted by local authorities are: (1) Chafer's dressing for American gooseberry-mildew; (2) Herrod's gooseberry-mildew dressing; (3) Simplex spray fluid; (4) V_2K fluid. Each was stated to contain in the strength prescribed by the Order liver of sulphur which the Board regard as the effective fungicide. As the preparations did not appear to contain any ingredient which would reduce the efficiency of the liver of sulphur or injure the bushes, the Board raised no objection to their use. The Board do not think that any useful purpose would be served at the present time by undertaking the examination and approval of proprietary preparations.

Work for Unemployed on Hackney Marshes.

MR. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state what are the reasons why the Central (Unemployed) Body with Hackney Marshes contiguous to the East End of London, have not long ago proposed a scheme or schemes for its reclamation, etc., which would have provided work for a large number of the unemployed during this winter of acute distress.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The subject has not been lost sight of by the Central (Unemployed) Body. There are about 160 men now employed at Hackney Marshes whose wages are defrayed by the Central Body and a further scheme of work in connection therewith is now under their consideration.

Work for Unemployed at Poplar.

MR. BROOKE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that since his Order removing the disqualifications of poor law relief and of two successive periods of works under the Central (Unemployed) Body, 772 men have registered themselves at the offices of the Poplar Distress Committee, making, together with those registered previous to that Order, a total, up to 21st November, of 2,932 men; and whether, considering that, up to the same date, only 202 of this total had been given work by the Central (Unemployed) Body, he proposes to take any steps to accelerate the action of that body in providing work for more of these men.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that the numbers stated in the Question are substantially correct. I believe that the Central (Unemployed) Body are making every effort to find suitable work for the unemployed of Poplar and elsewhere in London, and that they have now several schemes under consideration.

Second Division Clerkship Examinations.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware of the inconvenience caused to candidates who are preparing themselves for examination for clerkships in the second division of the Civil Service, by the intimation issued by the Civil Service Commissioners that it is not likely that a competition will be required in the spring and summer of 1909; and whether he can name any prospective date for the next competitive examination for clerkships in the second division.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) Examinations for clerkships in the Civil Service, whether in the second division or otherwise, are necessarily held to meet the requirements of public departments. While, therefore, I regret that inconvenience should be caused to candidates by the suspension of examinations, I could not regard such a reason as a justification for holding examinations when not required. As regards the immediate future I understand that the present supply of second division clerks will satisfy the public requirements for a great many months to come, and I do not think it would be possible at this stage to name even an approximate date for the next examination.

Proposed Purchase of Disused Coastguard Station at Fethard by New Ross Board of Guardians.

MR. FFRENCH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the New Ross Board of Guardians made an offer to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, about eighteen months ago, to purchase one of the houses belonging to the disused Coastguard station at Fethard for £120, or to rent it at £6 a year, proposing to use it as a dispensary; and whether, as no reply has been sent to the New Ross Guardians, he will ascertain what the Commissioners propose to do with reference to the guardians' offer.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I am informed that the house in question had to be reserved for the Customs service, and that this fact was pointed out in the course of correspondence between the Board's local officer and the clerk of the union, who subsequently discussed at an interview the possibility of the guardians acquiring another of the station houses. Pending the receipt of the further views of the guardians the matter has been in abeyance. The Board are redeeming the head rent charged on the property, and, as soon as the legal formalities have been completed, the property will be publicly advertised for sale, and the guardians will be invited to make an offer for such portion of the premises as will not be required for public purposes.

Civil Service Pensions—Widows and Orphans.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the approximate number of civil servants with pensionable service who have died since the promise of early action in connection with deferred pay was made by the Treasury in February last, and whose widows and orphans have consequently been deprived of sums which are admittedly their due; whether, in view of the constantly increasing number of widows and orphans of civil servants who are thus deprived of an admitted right, he will inquire whether the introduction of legislation on the subject has already been unduly delayed; and whether the matter can be expedited so as to admit of an immediate remedy for the existing state of affairs.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have no statistics of the number of deaths of civil servants with pensionable service since February last, nor can I say how many of them, if the proposed new scheme had been in operation, would have elected to sacrifice a part of the benefits secured them by the existing Superannuation Acts in order to secure the contemplated life assurance. There is, of course, no question of depriving the widows and orphans of such civil servants of anything due to them. The preparation of a Bill is being proceeded with as rapidly as possible, and it will, as I have already promised, be introduced next session. Regard being had to the complexity of the subject, I do not think there has been any unreasonable delay.

Railway Companies' Contributions to Local Rates.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the amounts contributed annually by the railways of the United Kingdom to the Exchequer and to local rates respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am unable to give the specific information desired by the right hon. Member in regard to contributions by British railways. I may, however, say that the amount of railway passenger duty received in 1907–8 was—

	£
For England - -	321,684
For Scotland - -	23,377
Total - - -	£345,061

Old-Age Pensions in Scotland—Issue of Regulations in Gaelic.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in view of the fact that the majority of persons over seventy years of age in the Western Highlands and Islands of Scotland speak Gaelic only, will he consider the expediency of having the regulations in regard to old-age pensions issued in those districts in Gaelic.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I may refer my hon. friend to the Answer which I gave on the 3rd instant to my hon. friend the Member for Sutherland. If he will bring to my notice any case of hardship, I shall be glad to have it inquired into, and will see that the necessary steps are taken in the matter.

Civil Rights of Christian Converts from the Hindu Religion.

Mr. E. H. LAMB (Rochester): To ask the Under-Secretary for India whether his attention has been called to an Answer given to a Question put in this House by the present Lord President of the Council, to the effect that in the case of *Dasappa* v. *Chikkamma*, dated 21st December, 1894, the chief Court of Mysore decided that a convert to Christianity, in consequence of his change of faith was *ipso facto* deprived of his right of guardianship over his children, and it was stated that an apostate from the Hindu religion loses his civil rights; whether his attention has been called to a judgment, dated 2nd September, 1907, delivered in the same State, of which the result has been that converts to the Christian religion suffer greater disability, by Hindu law, than one convicted and imprisoned for murder, inasmuch as converts are deprived of the ability to sue for their civil rights; whether he can supply a copy of the judgment referred to; whether he is aware that the Mysore Durbar appointed an influential committee, on which all castes were represented, to draft a regulation for the removal of these disabilities, but that such regulation, although prepared and published, was not adopted; and whether, in view of this draft regulation not having been brought into force, he can see his way to approach the Government of India with a view to suggesting to the Mysore Durbar the advisability of introducing the measure in question or some similar measure in order to remove the disabilities under which native converts to Christianity now suffer.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The Secretary of State is aware of the Answer given in this House on 12th March, 1903, as to the disabilities attaching to converts from Hinduism in the Mysore State. His attention has been drawn to the judgment of the chief Court of Mysore, to which the hon. Members refers, but he does not possess a copy of the judgment and cannot speak as to its exact purport. He has been informed unofficially that no steps have yet been taken by the Mysore Durbar to give effect to a regulation on the subject drawn up by a committee appointed by them. The Government of India are being asked to report upon the present position of the question.

Evicted Tenants—Case of Myles Sweeney.

Mr. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any action in the case of Myles Sweeney, of Lisacoghel, Drumkeerin, an evicted tenant on the Montgomery estate, County Leitrim, who was reinstated in May last and has not received any portion of the free grant to enable him to rebuild his house and stock his farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have not sanctioned any grant in this case.

Purchase of the Deering and Quinton Dick Estate at Dunmore.

Mr. HAZLETON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have been able to locate the whereabouts of Mr. George E. Deering; whether they have made any proposal to him for the sale of his Dunmore, County Galway, property; and whether they can give any information as to the position in which the Captain Quinton Dick (late Handcock) property, of Corrontilla, Dunmore, County Galway, now stands.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are not in a position to give any particulars in reference to these properties, which do not appear to be pending for sale before them.

Rents on the Roderick O'Connor Estate.

Mr. HAZLETON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board, which purchased the Roderick O'Connor estate in May, 1907, have again demanded this month from the tenants on the Galway portion of the estate the old rents without any reduction; if so, will he say why has no reduction been made as expected, and when is it to come into operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A year's rent has been demanded by the Congested Districts Board, as stated in the Question. The estate has not yet been vested in the Congested Districts Board as their property, and they have therefore no power to reduce the rents. The holdings on the Galway section of the estate will be re-sold as soon as possible after the estate has been vested in the Board.

Irish Junior Assistant Teachers Standard of Efficiency.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what standard of efficiency is being insisted upon by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland in the case of junior assistant teachers who have at least two years service, in order that they may qualify for their share of the £114,000 grant; whether he is aware that no stipulation whatever was made as to efficiency when the scale of payments was passed by Parliament; and what the Commissioners propose to do with moneys saved through some junior assistant teachers proving inefficient.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the revised Supplementary Estimate of 28th July last (H.C. Paper 255) in which it is stipulated that junior assistant mistresses sharing in the grant should have two years efficient service. The Commissioners of National Education inform me that a moderate standard of efficiency is required. I am unable to reply to the concluding portion of the Question, as the Commissioners have not yet completed the payment of junior assistant mistresses.

Purchase of Colonel Blake's Estate at Carnacon.

Mr. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the negotiations between the Estates Commissioners and Colonel M. C. J. Blake for the purchase of the latter's property at Carnacon, Ballyglass, County Mayo, have been successful; and, if not, will he state the cause.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In view of pending legislation the Estates Commissioners have decided not to make any offer for the estate at present.

Delay in Purchase of Estate at Caploughlan.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what is the cause of the delay in the completion of the sale to the tenants of the estate of the Endowed Commissioners of Education, situated at Caploughlan, Mountrath, Queen's County, whose agreements have been signed over two years; and, in view of the fact that the tenants are paying 4 per cent. on the purchase money, will he see that the vesting order is issued in this case with the least possible delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the purchase agreements in respect of this estate were not lodged until June, 1907. The Commissioners will deal with them in their proper order and with due regard to the priority of other estates in which the agreements were lodged earlier.

Sentence of Patrick Sweeney.

MR. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the appeal of Patrick Sweeney, Killadooley, Ballybrophy, Queen's County, fell through owing to a technical error on the part of his solicitors, who was sentenced to a term of six months imprisonment with hard labour by Messrs. Dease and Fitzgerald, resident magistrates, at the petty sessions in Rathdowney last July, for an alleged assault on the police-sergeant of Borris-in-Ossory, in connection with a cattle-drive, and after the expiration of this term ordered to find bail for twelve months or in default to go to prison for another six months, and taking into consideration that Sweeney had no time to prepare his defence, being arrested only a few hours before the Court sat, he will recommend a mitigation of the sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Patrick Sweeney was convicted at Rathdowney petty sessions in July last, of having assaulted a sergeant of the Royal Irish Constabulary while in the execution of his duty, by striking him on the head with a heavy club, and the sentence mentioned in the Question was imposed. He appealed to Quarter Sessions, but the Court decided that they had no jurisdiction to hear the appeal as the necessary notice had not been served. It is not within my province to advise the Lord-Lieutenant in his exercise of the clemency of the Crown, or to make any recommendation to His Excellency on the subject. I understand that the Lord-Lieutenant has already carefully considered a memorial sent to him by the prisoner, and has decided that the law must take its course.

Payment of Salaries of Irish National School Teachers.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Board of National Education is aware of the inconveniences and often hardships inflicted on Irish national teachers by the present practice of the Board in returning all salary claims, when passed for payment, to the managers of the schools, instead of sending them direct to the teachers; whether, in view of the fact that the manager has countersigned the claim in the first instance, and must therefore know its nature, what reason does the Board advance for returning the claim to him; and whether, if the Board cannot see its way to reverse its practice in all cases, would it be prepared to forward the claims direct in individual cases if requested to do so by the managers concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for West Clare on the 26th February, 1907.

Sale of the Jordan Estate at Cloanmore.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Jordan estate, situate at Cloanmore, Murneen Electoral District of the Claremorris Union, has been offered for sale to the Congested Districts Board; and, if so, whether he will state the number of years purchase asked by the landlord and offered by the Board, and when the negotiations will be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) This estate was offered to the Congested Districts Board in 1905; but, owing to the want of funds for improvements, they had in the following year to postpone the matter. The position remains unaltered.

Drainage of the River Robe.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have considered the advisability of undertaking the whole of the drainage of the River Robe, County Mayo; and, if so, whether there would be any chance of having the work started early in the coming spring, with a view to saving hundreds of acres that are flooded in the spring and autumn of each year and thereby rendered almost useless to the tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have nothing to add to my reply to a Question on this subject asked by the hon. Member on the 14th April last.

Count Blake Estate, County Mayo.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Count Blake estate, situate at Ballinafad, in the Castlebar Union, County Mayo, has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners or to the Congested Districts Board; and, if so, what is the number of years purchase asked by the landlord, and the number offered, if any, by either of the bodies named.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) This estate has not been offered for sale to the Congested Districts Board or the Estates Commissioners.

Begley Estate, Iskerlavally.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Begley estate, Iskerlavally, in the Claremorris Union, was offered to the Congested Districts Board for sale; and if so, how many years purchase was asked by the landlord and how many was offered by the tenants; whether the estate was inspected by the Board; whether the sale was sanctioned; and, if not, will he say why.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The estate has been purchased by the Congested Districts Board.

Acquisition of Sir Compton Domville's Estate.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have yet done anything in the way of acquiring the estate of Sir Compton Domville, situate in the parish of Aughamore, in the Claremorris Union; and, if not, whether they will re-open negotiations with a view to a speedy sale of the grass lands thereon, and the removal of congestion in the immediate neighbourhood.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The question of purchasing this estate was brought before the Congested Districts Board some time ago; but, owing to the want of funds for making improvements, they were obliged to postpone the matter. The solicitors for the estate were so informed in October, 1907. The position remains unaltered.

Sons of Head Constables and Cadetships in Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the sons of officers in the Royal Irish Constabulary and other young men who can procure nominations are eligible for examination for cadetships in that force, and that the sons of head constables, many of whom were prevented by the age limit from attaining higher rank, are debarred; and, if so, whether he will take the necessary steps to enable them to secure nomination for such examinations.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The facts are as stated. I do not propose to make any change in the existing system.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Portsmouth Government Contracts and Fair Wages.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the fact that the firm of Messrs. Morrison and Mason, Government contractors at Portsmouth, are not observing the Fair Wage Clause in the payment of their labourers; and whether he will take action in the matter.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): At the same time may I ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the contract with Messrs. Mason and Morrison, in connection with the construction of the new lock at Portsmouth, contains the Fair Wage Clause; if so, is he aware that the labourers employed by that firm are being paid 5d. per hour instead of 6d., the recognised rate in the neighbourhood; whether outside labourers are being engaged notwithstanding that there are still local men unemployed; and what course the Admiralty intend to adopt in the matter.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The point raised in the Question is one of considerable difficulty, and my hon. friend the Financial Secretary has gone into the whole matter with the greatest care. To summarise the conclusions come to, it would appear that 6d. an hour is the current rate for builders' labourers, but that the corporation and other employers who recognise this rate for general labourers do in fact pay less than 6d. per hour, and in some cases as little as 4½d., for labour which may be regarded as less skilled than that of the builders' labourer. The joint committee of the local railway companies pay men engaged on their permanent way 18s. per week, which, at forty-eight hours per week, would represent 4½d. an hour, and some of the unskilled labourers in the dockyard are paid at the rate of 5¼d. an hour. From all the evidence, it appears to be shown conclusively that, while the current rate for builders' labourers is 6d. an hour, the rate current in the locality for less skilled labour is certainly below that figure. Having regard to the class of labour employed by Messrs. Morrison and Mason for which they pay less than 6d. per hour, it cannot be said, on a review of all the circumstances, and of the rate current in the locality, that there has been any infraction of the Fair Wages Clause.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this firm paid 27s. 6d. up to September, and then reduced wages without notice?

MR. MCKENNA; I was not aware of that fact.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: Did not the Department three weeks ago apply to the United Trades Labour Council at Portsmouth in regard to this matter?

MR. MCKENNA: Yes, Sir.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): How is the recognised rate in the neighbourhood arrived at? Does it not vary in different trades?

MR. MCKENNA: It varies more particularly in regard to the cost of living in the district. The Admiralty only discover it by close inquiry among all firms.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): When the Secretary to the Admiralty makes inquiries does he consult the leaders of the local trade unions?

MR. MCKENNA: I will inquire.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Does he consult those who pay the lowest wages only?

MR. MCKENNA: I do not think that is a suggestion which ought to be made. We consult all the employers in a neighbourhood, and those whom we have consulted in this instance recognise that though the rate referred to is a low one for builders' labourers a still lower rate obtains for less skilled labour.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to attach a schedule rate of wages to all official contracts?

MR. MCKENNA: No. We are acting on the rule laid down by the House of Commons in its Resolution.

MR. W. THORNE: The results are not very satisfactory.

Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when a definite decision may be expected on the question of issuing fresh kits to members of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve who have completed three years service, and also on the question of granting signal ratings to members of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve who have specialised in signalling; whether he is aware that the first matter has engaged the attention of the Admiralty for over two years, and the second one for more than eleven months; and whether he proposes to take steps to secure that Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve matters shall be settled in future with greater expedition.

MR. MCKENNA: A temporary arrangement for issuing new kits to Volunteers who enrol after completing three years was approved in December last and is still in force. Details of a scheme on the basis of the new Army system are now under the consideration of the Admiralty Volunteer Committee.

The question of the formation of a signal branch of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve involves financial consideration and correspondence with another Department, and it is hoped that a decision will be arrived at before very long. These matters have been under consideration for the time stated. In both cases there have been considerable financial difficulties, and it is not considered that any avoidable delay has taken place.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the great difficulty caused to recruiting by the action of the Admiralty?

MR. MCKENNA: I do not think we are causing any difficulty in that way. We deplore the delay quite as much as the right hon. Gentleman, and I have explained it in the best way I can.

Sunday Labour at Rosyth.

MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the feeling in Scotland against Sunday labour, and seeing that the declared object of pushing on with the works at Rosyth is to give immediate employment rather than to have an early completion, he will insert a clause in the contracts forbidding Sunday labour.

MR. LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that, may I ask whether he or any other authority has been committed publicly or otherwise to the statement that the object of pushing on with the works at Rosyth is to give immediate employment rather than to have an early completion?

MR. MCKENNA: No such statement has been made expressly or implied, publicly or privately. Work such as that of pumping may have to be carried on at any time, including Sunday; but Sunday work is discouraged and is not allowed without the written permission of the superintending engineer.

Coastguard Stations in the Isle of Wight.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if it had been decided to withdraw the coastguard from the Foreland, Ventnor division; and, if so, what provision will be made to man the Bembridge lifeboat of the Royal National Lifeboat Institution at present manned by these men.

MR. MCKENNA: It has been decided to close the Foreland coastguard detachment, at which there are three men, on the 1st December, 1908, but three coastguard men will continue to reside at Foreland for duty at Culver Cliff signal station. All arrangements for manning Royal National Lifeboat Institution lifeboats are made by the Royal National Lifeboat Institution. The crew of the costguard station at Bembridge, and the three men above mentioned at Foreland, will be available to assist the lifeboat service as far as their other naval and revenue duties permit, provided the men themselves volunteer for the service. The coastguard men are not liable to be ordered on lifeboat service.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): At what date was this decision come to?

MR. MCKENNA: I cannot say without notice.

Distribution of Cavalry.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on what principle the present distribution of cavalry in the United Kingdom is based.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The primary consideration in the distribution of cavalry regiments in the United Kingdom is the accommodation which actually exists for them. Subject to this consideration every endeavour is made to group, in proximity to one another, the units of the various cavalry brigades of the field Army, thus rendering possible the supervision by the brigadier of the regiments under his command.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give an approximate date at which the application of this provision to Scotland is likely to result in the stationing of a cavalry regiment there?

MR. HALDANE'S reply was understood to be to the effect that there was already one regiment in Scotland.

Insanitary Barracks.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will grant a Return showing the barracks in the United Kingdom which are reported by the Army Medical Department to be in an indifferent sanitary state, as judged by modern standards.

MR. HALDANE: It is quite obvious that, owing to the date of construction of the barracks, many of our buildings must necessarily fall short of what is considered desirable in these days; but I am not prepared to admit that any are in a dangerous condition, and I cannot agree that the Return asked for should be compiled.

MR. ASHLEY: But as we know officially that many of the barracks are in an indifferent condition from a sanitary point of view why should not the House be told which they are?

MR. HALDANE: The House may gather from official Reports that there is a state of things which we very much deplore and which we are getting put right as quickly as possible. But it is impossible to go into detail as to the various barracks.

The Irish Command.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how it is proposed to train in peace the 6th Division of the Irish Command for the duties it will have to perform in war, in view of the fact that not even divisional cavalry of two squadrons is stationed in the command.

MR. HALDANE: The divisional cavalry are formed on mobilisation from the mounted infantry, and in this respect the 6th Division does not differ from the other divisions. As regards training, the necessary mounted troops can be provided from the cavalry brigade or from the South Irish Horse.

MR. ASHLEY: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman see his way to spend a small amount of money in order that a cavalry regiment may be stationed there?

MR. HALDANE: That is quite unnecessary, as the hon. Member will see if he looks at the organisation.

New Field Howitzer.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State of War whether he can now give any information with reference to the recent trials of the new field howitzer, especially as to weight and range.

MR. HALDANE: No, Sir. I am not at present in a position to give information to the hon. Member.

Canadian Immigration Law.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state whether it is still possible for a British subject to be summarily deported from the Dominion of Canada without any form of trial and on the ground of being temporarily out of employment.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby): As I stated in reply to my hon. friend's Question on the 2nd November, the Secretary of State is in communication with the Dominion Government on the question of the law to which he refers, and I am not yet in a position to give any further information on the subject.

British Indians in Transvaal Prisons.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received any official information showing that the Indians, including Mr. Gandhi, were on the 17th October working on the market square of Volksrust at road-making.

COLONEL SEELY: It appears from a telegram from the Governor of 3rd November that Mr. Gandhi, who worked on an agricultural shows grounds digging holes for trees and weeding in a municipal plantation and the gaol garden, had never performed hard labour on the public streets. The telegram does not state whether this was true also of the other Indians.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): Was not this gentleman imprisoned for a purely technical offence?

Colonel SEELY: I have given all the information in my possession.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): Is Mr. Gandhi the gentleman who delivered an address to Members of this House here a year ago?

Colonel SEELY: I do not know, and I do not see how that affects the case.

Mr. BYLES: I only wanted the information.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that white people are not allowed to work with other people in the public streets, and cannot that arrangement be extended to British Indians?

Colonel SEELY: I will inquire.

The Charges against Dinizulu.

Mr. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Colonial Office is yet in possession of information enabling him to state upon what charges Dinizulu has been indicted and which of the charges for which he was arrested have not been proceeded with.

Colonel SEELY: Yes, Sir; the full text of the indictment will appear in a Parliamentary Paper which is being presented to-day and should be in the hands of Members this evening.

Colonial Immigration Laws.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will cause to be circulated by the Immigration Office particulars of the disabilities imposed on British immigrants by certain of the Colonies.

Colonel SEELY: Full information as to the restrictions on immigration into the self-governing Colonies is given in the Circulars relating to those Colonies issued by the Emigrants' Information Office. The Circulars are issued free of cost. Considerably over 300,000 of them are distributed in the course of a year.

Consular Reports on Industrial Development.

Mr. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to a Report by Sir F. Offenheimer, Consul General at Frankfort, on the industrial development of Germany in connection with trusts and syndicates; whether any extra remuneration is granted to Consuls issuing specially elaborate Reports of this nature; and whether Reports modelled on these lines could be obtained from our Consuls in other European and American countries.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. McKinnon Wood, Glasgow, St. Rollox): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, and to the second part in the negative. As regards the last part of the Question, the attention of His Majesty's Diplomatic representatives and Consular Officers at important posts abroad will be directed to the suggestion, and they will be invited to furnish from time to time such information on those lines as circumstances will permit.

Mr. WEDGWOOD: May I ask whether the out-of-pocket expenses incurred by Consuls in collecting statistics are defrayed?

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: I am not aware that there have been any out-of-pocket expenses.

Mr. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) asked if instructions would be given to Consuls in various European countries where protection obtains to get comparative prices.

[No Answer was returned.]

The Lado Enclave—Destruction of Elephants.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if his attention has been called to the condition of affairs existing in the Lado enclave, forming part of our Central African Possessions; if the troops of the Congo Free State have been withdrawn from the territory, and during the absence of authority the elephants are being destroyed wholesale by white adventurers.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: We have seen allusions in the Press to the situation to which the hon. Member refers. The

Lado enclave is a part of the Soudan, and not of the British Central African Possessions; it is in the occupation of His Majesty King Leopold II. under the Agreement between Great Britain and the Independent State of the Congo of 9th May, 1906. We are unable to make any statement as to the movements of Congolese troops in the enclave, but inquiries will be made as to the truth of the reports respecting the destruction of elephants there.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the lease of the Lado enclave to His Majesty the King of the Belgians is still in force; if the withdrawal of the troops of the Congo Free State from the enclave and the leaving of the enclave without responsible government is in accordance with the terms of the lease; and whether, seeing that the destruction of the herds of elephants there by the lessee or his agents will cause injury to the enclave, he will say what steps he proposes to take under the circumstances.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: Until the discussions between His Majesty's Government and the Belgian Government as to the conditions on which Great Britain will recognise the transfer of the Congo State to Belgium are concluded, the Agreements of May 9th, 1906, under which the Lado enclave is leased to His Majesty King Leopold II. remains effective. There is nothing in the terms of that Agreement affecting the movements of troops or other administrative questions in the Lado enclave. It may be stated that the Government of the Congo State ratified the International African Game Convention of May, 1900, though they did not undertake to be bound by its terms till the ratifications of all the other signatory Powers had been received. We are, however, confident that the Congo Government, acting in the spirit of the Convention, will arrest any wanton or wholesale destruction of elephants in the Lado enclave, should the reports as to such slaughter prove to be accurate, and we are instructing His Majesty's Minister at Brussels to make representations accordingly.

Mr. FELL: Is it a fact that, pending the discussion now going on, this is a kind of No Man's Land, and that adventurers are now shooting elephants by the thousand?

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: I do not know that you can call it a No Man's Land. It is leased to the King of the Belgians, and I hope that the position to which the hon. Member refers is only a temporary one.

Old-Age Pensions—Claimants over Seventy Years of Age.

Mr. TIMOTHY DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state the number of persons over seventy years of age in England, Wales (including Monmouthshire), Scotland, and Ireland; whether he can give the number of such persons in receipt of poor law relief in each part of the Kingdom; the number of claims for old-age pensions up to date; and the percentage of persons claiming old-age pensions to the population over seventy years of age in each country, deducting those who are in receipt of poor law relief.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs): The number of persons over seventy years of age in the United Kingdom in 1908 is estimated at 898,000, in England (excluding Monmouthshire); 59,000 in Wales (including Monmouthshire); 134,000 in Scotland; and 184,000 in Ireland. Of these it is estimated that approximately 220,000 are in receipt of poor law relief in England, 16,000 in Wales (including Monmouthshire), 19,000 in Scotland, and 32,000 in Ireland. Applications for old-age pensions have been received (up to the 21st instant) from 367,197 persons in England; 23,960 in Wales, 68,785 in Scotland, and 193,138 in Ireland. The percentage of the persons claiming old-age pensions to the population over seventy years of age, after deducting those in receipt of poor law relief, is therefore, on the basis of the figures quoted above:—In England 54 per cent., in Wales 56 per cent., in Scotland 60 per cent., and Ireland 128 per cent.

Married Women and Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the event of a local pensions committee deciding to grant a pension to a married woman whose husband is in receipt of poor law relief, the pension officer will be instructed to appeal.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: In such cases, as explained by my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board on the 26th instant, the wife will be disqualified only if relief is given to her direct, or to her husband for her on her account. In any case in which a married woman to whom a pension is granted appears to be subject to this disqualification, the pension officer will be instructed to appeal against the award.

Unestablished Service and Pensions.

MR. CROOKS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware of the number of men in the various Government offices who are promoted to the establishment for meritorious work and conduct, and who, nevertheless, are unable to count the whole unestablished service towards pension; and whether he will take steps to remove this hardship.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The proportion of previous unestablished service (if any) which a person promoted to the establishment is allowed to count for pension depends upon the terms upon which he is promoted. The permission to count any part of such service is a special privilege, refusal of which cannot in my opinion properly be described as a hardship, and I cannot undertake to extend still further the very liberal concessions which have been made in this direction of recent years.

Old-Age Pensions Regulations.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, for the convenience of the Irish-speaking population in Ireland, he will cause copies of the Old-Age Pensions Act, and copies of the forms and regulations appertaining thereto, to be printed in Irish.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I understand that no difficulty has been experienced by pension officers in Ireland in regard to the language question. Should any case of hardship be brought to my notice, I should be very glad to make the necessary arrangements to deal with it.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman thinking of printing the regulations in any other language than English—Welsh, for instance?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have already explained to hon. Members for Scotland that if any grievance is brought to my notice I am ready to print the regulations in any language.

Unredeemed Banknotes.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the total value of notes issued by the Bank of England in 1867, and the total value presented for payment; whether the £14,055 written off on account of notes issued in that year is the total value, or only part value, of those not since presented; and whether the State receives any portion of such moneys, or whether they are all annexed by the Bank from year to year.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am informed by the Bank of England that after this lapse of time it is difficult to ascertain the exact value of the notes issued to the public during 1867, but that it appears to have been about £330,000,000. Of this total, all but £14,515 have been paid. The amount of £14,055 recently written off comprises the outstanding notes for £14,515, less a sum of £460, representing notes which have been written off in previous years but have been presented and paid during the current year. The Bank remains liable, under Section 6 of the Bank Act, 1892, to pay written-off notes, if presented for payment; and the State has no claim to any portion of the value of such notes.

MR. MACVEAGH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will also get the figures of the value of notes not presented to the Bank of Scotland, the Bank of Ireland, and the other joint stock banks of the United Kingdom?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will consider that.

Privilege Cabs at Woolwich Arsenal Station.

MR. CROOKS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will inquire of the Woolwich police as to the working of the privilege cab system at the Arsenal Station; whether it would be in the interest of the travelling public to declare the station an open one; and whether friction is caused by the privileged cabman taking the outside stand in addition to the privilege stand.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am making the inquiry suggested in the first part of the hon. Member's Question, and if he will permit me, I will defer my reply to the second and third part until it has been completed.

The Treatment of Suffragist Prisoners.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will give details as to the prison treatment of woman suffragists committed in default of providing sureties for good behaviour, under the heads: prison uniform, dietary, correspondence, visits, exercises, association, remission of sentences, and punishments.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The suffragist prisoners, like other second division female prisoners, wear a distinctive dress. Their diet is that prescribed for the second division by the rules for local prisoners made on the 2nd September, 1901, under the Prisons Act, 1898, the items of which are fully set out in the rules, with such additions or alterations as may be prescribed by the medical officer in individual cases. When the sentence exceeds one month, they may write and receive a letter and a visit once a month, and special letters and visits are allowed to all prisoners in connection with matters of urgent business. They are allowed to exercise for one hour daily, and to work in association for a time daily whenever associated labour can be arranged. In common with all prisoners, they can earn a remission of one-sixth of their sentences by good conduct and industry, if they are sentenced to more than one month's imprisonment. They are subject to the ordinary Prison Rules (number 78, and following of the Rules for local Prisons) as to punishment for misconduct.

The Press and Coroners' Courts.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he is aware that, at an inquest held at the coroner's Court of St. Giles's, London, on the 21st inst., the coroner's officer refused to admit the representatives of three news agencies and numerous daily papers, whilst admitting two journalists; whether he is aware that a written protest handed to the coroner's officer was not delivered to the coroner, and will he say what notice has been taken of the incident; and what steps have been or will be taken, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent its repetition in that or any other coroner's Court.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am informed by the coroner that the exclusion of a certain number of Press representatives, who had arrived late, was due to a misunderstanding arising from instructions given to prevent overcrowding in the court-room, which is a very small one. It appears that four journalists were present during the proceedings. The question of what persons should be admitted to the inquest was entirely in the discretion of the coroner, who informs me that the Courts over which he presides are always open to the public and to the Press, so far as the accommodation will allow. The incident does not appear to me to call for any further action.

MR. BYLES: May the House understand that the coroner's Court is a public Court, and that no coroner has a right to pick and choose between the representatives of the Press?

MR. GLADSTONE: Of course I am not responsible for the coroner's action, but I take it that they are admitted as long as there is room.

MR. BYLES: Is the coroner's Court everywhere a public Court, and has any coroner a right to pick and choose?

MR. GLADSTONE: It is a public Court under the control of the coroner, who has to make the best arrangements he can for the public interest.

MR. BYLES: It is most important that the House should know——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. If the Question is so important the hon. Member had better give notice.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any expression of regret from the coroner, or any assurance that this will not be repeated?

MR. GLADSTONE: As will be gathered from the Answer already given, the coroner has said that his Court was open to the public and the Press so far as the accommodation would allow. I have received no further communication.

Chelmsford Election Disturbances.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can now state the result of his inquiries into the disorderly scenes connected with the bye-election in Chelmsford and the injuries inflicted upon the Liberal agent.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am informed that on the evening of the 25th inst. the police sergeant stationed at Ingatestone was asked to send some constables to the working men's club the same evening to assist in keeping order. He replied that keeping order at the meeting was a matter for the stewards, and that he could not go into the hall. He was outside the hall with two constables at the time of the assault, and did not witness it, nor was he called on by anyone to assist in preventing violence. The first time Mr. Martin came outside the hall he mentioned the violence to which he had been subjected, but could not give the names of his assailants. Afterwards when Mr. Martin had returned to the the hall and fainted, the police took him to his lodgings on a stretcher. I have no reason to suppose that the police have in any way failed in their duty in respect of the disorderly and reprehensible incidents arising from the Chelmsford election.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: Am I to understand from that Answer that Mr. Martin was seriously injured, or were the reports exaggerated?

MR. GLADSTONE: It appears that Mr. Martin was seriously injured, but the last report I received on Saturday evening gave, I am glad to say, a favourable account of his condition.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is within his knowledge that different police forces in the country take different views of their duties with regard to preserving order within public meetings; and whether he does not think that it might be well to appoint a committee, not necessarily a Parliamentary committee, of some kind to inquire as to the conduct of the police in general, without reflecting on any particular police force, and to lay down what should be the duty of the police with regard to keeping order in public meetings?

MR. GLADSTONE: The right hon. Gentleman is quite correct. The practice varies in different localities, and I will consider the suggestion he has made that an inquiry should be instituted.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of drafting extra police in order to preserve order in this disturbed district?

MR. WARDLE (Stockport): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the question of the powers of watch committees with regard to the police as a whole?

MR. GLADSTONE: That is a general question. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will give notice.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Rugby): Will the right hon. Gentleman circulate with the Votes a copy of the report he has received from the Home Office experts as to the state of Mr. Martin's health; there are so many different reports?

MR. GLADSTONE: I really do not know to what my hon. friend alludes, unless it is a report in the newspapers. Obviously no Home Office expert has gone down with regard to Mr. Martin's health.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in certain public meetings recently held the superintendent of police in districts where disturbances were anticipated has entered the hall and closed the meeting?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, instances of that sort do occur, and I have said that there is a variety of practice.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Why not apply to the Irish Secretary to send some of his police to this disturbed district.

Dangerous Performances on the Stage.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to the recent case of manslaughter on the stage; and if he will take into consideration the desirability of prohibiting all public performances involving danger to men, women, children, and animals.

MR. GLADSTONE: I presume the hon. Member refers to the unfortunate accident which occurred last Monday night at the Middlesex Music Hall, and which resulted in the death of a man who was hit by a rifle bullet in the course of a stage performance. The jury brought in a verdict, not of manslaughter, but of accidental death. The performance is, in my opinion, reprehensible, and ought not to have been allowed by those responsible for it. I am communicating with the London County Council on the subject.

MR. H. C. LEA: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that two years ago I put a Question to him on this subject of prohibiting performances of this character, and he rather gave me to understand that he would appoint a Departmental Committee to inquire into the subject?

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir, I hinted at legislation. A Bill was prepared, and, I think, introduced, but its reception was so extremely unfavourable that the Bill has not been heard of since.

MR. H. C. LEA: In view of the altered opinion of this House, would the right hon. Gentleman bring it in again?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not at all sure that the opinion of the House has altered.

The "All-Red" Route.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if any progress has been made toward the establishment of the All-Red Route, and if any statement on the matter will be made during the present session.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): As has been already stated by my hon. friend the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, the informal Committee who are investigating this question are considering an Interim Report, but it is unlikely that any statement on the matter will be made during the present session.

MR. FELL: Has any progress really been made towards the establishment of the All-Red Route, beyond getting this Report?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have nothing to add to my Answer.

Foreign Prison-Made Goods.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that foreign prison-made carpets are imported into this country; and what steps are being taken by the Board of Trade to give effect in the case of carpets to the provisions of the Foreign Prison-Made Goods Acts of 1897.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Board of Trade are not aware of any importations of the nature referred to by my hon. friend. In order to enable action to be taken in a case of this kind, it is necessary for the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs to be furnished by the complainant with satisfactory proof that the articles in question were actually manufactured in prison.

North British Railway Company and their Employees.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can now state the result of his conference with the directors of the North British Railway Company anent their action in compelling six of their employees to withdraw from the Ladybank (Fife) Town Council.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Board of Trade have been in communication with the North British Railway Company on this subject and have received the following reply from the general manager: —"Dear Sir Hudson, With reference to our conversation at the

Conference yesterday as to Mr. Keir Hardie's question regarding employees of this Company as town councillors of Ladybank, I beg to say that this Company has not, nor has it ever had, any rule or regulation which prevents their employees from being members of the town councils. To look no further than the case of Ladybank itself, Ladybank has been a burgh since 1876, and from that date servants of this Company have been continuously members of the town council. The company has no intention to enforce any restriction upon its employees to prevent them serving on town councils so long as such service is not inconsistent with their duty to the Company.—I am, etc., (signed) W. F. Jackson."

Sir Hudson Kearley, Bart., M.P.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: But is the right hon. Gentleman aware that six of the employees of this company have been compelled to resign their seats on the Ladybank Town Council, owing to the action of the company? Is there any guarantee there will be no repetition of that in the future?

MR. CHURCHILL: I think the letter I have just read is the guarantee.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Has the general manager of this railway in any way explained why these six men were obliged to withdraw from the town council? Is it alleged the meetings of the council would interfere with their duties to the company?

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot carry all the details in my head. I will make inquiry, but I think that probably the explanation is that it was felt their work on the council would be prejudicial to the discharge of their duty to the company.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the men have served on the council for years without complaint, and it was only when a dispute arose with the town clerk, who is solicitor to the railway company, that they were compelled to withdraw?

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. H. C. LEA: Is there not a Bill affecting this company coming on to-night? Will the right hon. Gentleman telegraph to the general manager for an explanation with regard to the case of these men, and get a reply before the Bill is taken?

MR. CHURCHILL: I will endeavour to get all the information I can.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Has the question of the Ladybank Town Council any relation to the Bill coming before the House?

[No Answer was returned.]

Old-Age Pensions Disqualifications.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, when a son contributes to the maintenance of his father, and the contribution is paid through the guardians, that sum is regarded as poor relief, so as to debar the father from receiving an old-age pension, although he has not cost the poor rate anything.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I think I can only say generally that where a son or other relative of a poor person repays to the guardians, whether in whole or in part, the sums given by the guardians to that person, the repayment does not, as I am advised, remove the disqualification for an old-age pension. Where the payment to the guardians by the relative is not by way of reimbursement in respect of relief given by them to the poor person but by way of voluntary contribution to his maintenance, the facts of the particular case would have to be ascertained before an opinion could be expressed with regard to it.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Are we to understand that there can exist a case in which a man has cost the public nothing, and yet he is debarred from his old-age pension?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Probably, yes.

MR. BELLOC: Well, it ought not to be.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In the cases which not infrequently occur where several children are willing to contribute to the support of their parent, but it is necessary to get the board of guardians to enforce payment in order to bring in one outstanding son or daughter who will not do his or her duty, and where in that way the contribution is made through the board of guardians, is the old person really to be disqualified although no part of his cost has fallen upon the rates?

MR. JOHN BURNS: That particular case has not been remitted to the Law Officers. If the right hon. Member will send it on I shall have much pleasure in sending it to the Law Officers.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked whether disqualification in cases of this kind was by the Act itself or by a regulation of the Local Government Board.

MR. JOHN BURNS said it had been laid down in previous decisions that in a case where, in anticipation of a person becoming chargeable to the guardians, his son or daughter used the guardians as the medium of paying money for his or her maintenance, the disqualification would not apply, as there was no Poor Law relief given.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could not get over this difficulty by getting the Chancellor of the Exchequer to issue a new secret instruction.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I do not think it would be improved upon if one were issued.

Notification of Consumption.

MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can see his way in the proposed legislation for making compulsory the notification of consumption in the case of paupers to extend the proposal of compulsory notification to all cases of consumption.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I do not contemplate legislation on this subject at the present time. The action I propose to take as regards the notification of consumption in poor law cases will be taken under the existing powers of the Local Government Board, and must, I think, be limited to such cases.

Liverpool Distress Relief Works.

MR. MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Liverpool Distress Committee, having practically exhausted their funds, have announced that they will be compelled on Tuesday next to discharge 380 men now employed by them on relief works; and, if so, whether it is his intention to respond to the appeal of the committee for a grant-in-aid to prevent the collapse of their work and the consequences which would be involved in throwing so many men out of employment.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am to-day making a payment of £1,000 to the distress committee from the Parliamentary grant. I am glad to be able to add that, since the hon. Member gave notice of his Question, the immediate pressure upon the distress committee has already been relieved, as they have received additional funds from public subscriptions amounting to £1,250.

Local Loans.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state how many applications for sanction of loans are now under the consideration of his Board, and what is the amount involved; and whether he can say approximately what time will elapse before his Board will have come to a decision respecting the applications.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The information asked for in the first part of the Question is not readily available, and could only be obtained after an examination of several hundred files of papers, which would involve much time and labour. Nor is it possible to give a definite reply to the latter part of the Question; the time which must necessarily elapse before a decision can be arrived at with respect to a particular application depends largely on the complexity of the matters to which it relates and the sufficiency of the information supplied in connection with it.

Telegraphic Communication with the Orkneys.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he has received the account of the total wreck of the "Isle of Erin," and the loss of many valuable lives, given by the lighthouse keeper, North Ronaldshay, Orkney, suggesting that if there had been telegraphic communication the ship and crew might have been saved; and if he will take the earliest possible opportunity of extending the telegraphic system to North Ronaldshay, taking into account the irregularity of the mail delivery and the difficulties of obtaining medical aid of any sort, and the number of people on the island.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I have seen an account of the wreck and the suggestion to which the hon. Member refers. I informed my hon. friend in March, 1906, that I could not provide the telegraph extension to North Ronaldshay because the cost would be prohibitive, as compared with the revenue. I am considering whether I could undertake it on special terms of guarantee.

Adult Night Messengers in the Post Office.

Mr. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the recommendation of the Select Committee meant that all full time adult night messengers were to be placed upon the establishment irrespective of the age limit, the intention of the Committee being that these men should obtain the benefit of a small retiring pension; and whether he will arrange that in exceptional cases the messengers will be appointed under Clause VII. of the Order in Council of the 4th June, 1870, as was done in the case of the established telegraphists at the Central Telegraph Office.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The Committee's recommendation was that "any full time messenger who has been employed for five years and can obtain a Civil Service certificate should be placed on the establishment," and this is being done. The unestablished telegraphists at the Central Telegraph Office were in the same way required to obtain Civil Service certificates before appointment.

The Mall Improvement.

Mr. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether it is intended to construct a roadway between the Mall and Birdcage Walk, or only to widen the existing footway.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. L. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): It is only intended to widen the existing footpath for a short distance behind the new gates.

Grants to Roman Catholic Schools.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what would have been the total sum payable to the Association of Roman Catholic Schools in the last year for which figures are available if the present Education Bill had then been in force and if all Catholic schools in England and Wales had joined such an association; and what sum per child in average attendance this total represents.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Trevelyan, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Excluding schools which would not be eligible to contract out under Clause 3 of the Bill, the total sum payable would be, approximately, £705,000, representing an average of about 49s. 7d. per child in average attendance.

Royal College of Science, London.

Mr. GWYNN (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the teaching staff of the Royal College of Science, London, received substantial additions to income and exceptional pension privileges on the transfer of the administration of that college to the Imperial College of Science and Technology in January last; whether he can state on what principle the Treasury has acted in awarding these special terms; and if the principle is applicable to professors in Irish colleges under similar circumstances.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): On the transfer of the Royal College of Science to the governing body of the Imperial College the salaries of the teaching staff ceased to be payable directly out of public funds and I have therefore no information in respect of them. The Treasury, however, under the powers conferred upon them by the

Superannuation Acts, agreed to award to these gentlemen compensation allowances and gratuities where justified by length of service, on the abolition of their offices under the Board of Education. The compensation of officers transferred from Irish Colleges is provided for in Section 16 of the Irish Universities Act, and in this connection I beg to refer the hon. Member to my reply of the 4th May last to the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University.

Mr. GWYNN: Am I to understand that the same principle applies to both England and Ireland when a college is transferred from Civil Service *status* to an outside *status?*

Mr. HOBHOUSE: So far as the provisions of the Irish University Act admit, yes.

Second Division Clerks.

Mr. S. COLLINS (Lambeth, Kennington): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the higher salaries prescribed by the Order in Council of 21st December, 1907, were afforded to second division clerks on the ground that their salaries under the Order in Council of 21st March, 1890, were inadequate during the earlier years of service; and, if so, will he explain why the lower salaries under the latter Order in Council, to which second division clerks in the Estate Duty Office are required to revert on promotion to the first division, are considered sufficient to enable these clerks to support themselves in their higher states.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative, and the second part does not therefore arise.

Mr. S. COLLINS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that it is usual for a clerk upon promotion to be given the prospect of a higher maximum salary as well as to receive an immediate increase of pay, he will explain why, in the case of second division clerks in the Estate Duty Office promoted to the first division, the conferring of a higher maximum is to be accompanied by a substantial reduction of salary.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I would refer my hon. friend to previous replies which I have given on this subject on 10th November and 13th July, 1908.

Estate Duty Office Clerks.

Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that the second division clerks in the Estate Duty Office, London, affected by the Order in Council of 21st December, 1907, elected to have their salaries readjusted thereunder before any question of promotion was brought to their notice, and seeing that the promotion of the clerks in question is to be by selection on the grounds of special competency and merit, such selection not having yet been made, the question has not at present arisen with regard to any individual clerk, he will state the reasons why specially selected clerks in the Estate Duty Office are to be required under that Order to enter the first division at a salary less than their readjusted salaries, while this was not made a condition in the case of the clerks of the Admiralty recently promoted, and whether it is to be understood that the chronological accident that one scheme ante-dated the other in its conception, though post-dating it in execution, is the sole reason for distinguishing the men to be promoted in the Estate Duty Office from those already promoted in the Admiralty.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: As regards the promotion of second division clerks the circumstances in the Estate Duty Office are different from those in the Admiralty. The Estate Duty Office is undergoing a reorganisation, which would have involved the disappearance of the second division staff if the present course had not been taken. Promotion is different from the mode adopted in the Admiralty, where there has been no general decision to make promotions, and a particular clerk is only promoted on the ground of exceptional merit.

Mr. CARLILE: Why is there this difference of treatment between the two classes?

MR. HOBHOUSE: The circumstances in the one case are considered greatly superior to those in the other.

Commissioners of Woods and Forests and Small Holdings.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somersetshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Commissioners of Woods and Forests will make it a practice in the future to give the first offer of all vacant farms in their possession to the small holdings committee of the county in which they are situate.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): Yes, but with due regard of course to the circumstances of each case.

The Board of Agriculture.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somersetshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he could recommend an early meeting of the Board of Agriculture to take into consideration the urgent necessity for pressing forward in all counties where applications have been made the best means to meet the requirements of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The President does not propose to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend, as he does not think that any useful purpose would be thereby served.

Secondary Schools in Scotland.

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland why the statement of income, expenditure, and liabilities of secondary schools for the year 1905–6, given in Table I., page 953, of the Report of the Committee on Education in Scotland for 1907–8, is only for that date; why that table and the various other particulars of secondary education in Scotland given in that Report up to page 1013, inclusive, do not include all details of these schools and their expenditure up to and including 15th May, 1908, seeing that these details were necessarily in the hands of the Department since the latter date; and whether he will endeavour to print and circulate these as a separate paper at the earliest opportunity.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The statement of income, expenditure, and liabilities of secondary schools for the year 1906–7 (being the latest audited accounts available), were included in a separate Paper (Cd. 4310) issued on 19th September last. The other particulars referred to by the hon. Member (the latest available) will also be found in this Paper.

Drumkeerin Evicted Tenant.

MR. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet taken any action with a view of reinstating Peter D. Kelly, an evicted tenant on the West estate, Drumkeerin, County Leitrim, who returned from America with the hope of being reinstated and is still remaining in Ireland awaiting the decision of the Commission.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that Kelly's application is being considered in connection with the allotment of untenanted land which they are acquiring.

The King-Harman Estate.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that in November, 1903, terms of purchase were agreed upon between the vendor of the King-Harman estate situated in the counties of Roscommon and Sligo, and the tenants on the same; that one of the conditions agreed to by the vendor was that the Estates Commissioners be requested to purchase the whole estate with a view to secure the turbary for the tenants; that previous to the sale the landlord exercised the power of letting the turbary rights to the tenants, even where the bogs upon the estate were within the boundaries of the farms of certain individual tenants, charging the latter with rent for cutting turf in the bogs on their own farms in the same way as he charged rent to the occupiers of outlying farms in the district; that the Estates Commissioners at the time of the sale recognised the rights of the occupiers as a body to turbary rights on the estate by vesting the bogs which had been held direct by the landlord in trustees for the benefit of the said occupiers; that one of the former tenants upon whose holding there was a large tract of bog which, previous to the sale, had been, according to the custom of the estate, let off as turbary from year to year to a number of tenants in the district, denied all access after the sale to the bog in question to the former users, save at enormous rentals; and whether, seeing that this action causes loss and inconvenience to about 200 families resident in the district, and that a decision in favour of the former users was given by the Judicial Commissioners, but was reversed upon a technical point by the Court of Appeal in February of this year, he will, in his amending Act, introduce a clause restoring to the 200 occupiers in question their former rights of turbary and making the Act of 1903 clear upon the point involved in this case.

MR. BIRRELL: This estate was purchased by the Estates Commissioners in 1905. The landlord had in his own hands certain bogs, containing in all 1,308 acres, and these have been vested in trustees for the benefit of the tenant purchasers. He also had the right to empower persons to take turf, on payment to him of a bog rent, from other bogs lying within the boundaries of certain holdings on the estate, the tenants of these holdings having the right of turbary for their own use only. The Commissioners were asked to make regulations authorising the taking of turf on these bogs, but the Court of Appeal decided that the Commissioners had no power to make such regulations, as the holdings had been vested in the purchasers without any reservation of turbary. I do not think it would be possible to introduce a clause into the Land Bill for the purpose suggested in the last paragraph of the Question.

Waterville (Kerry) Road Scheme.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an inspection has been made by the Congested Districts Board of the proposed road between Cahersivane and Clogvoola, near Waterville, County Kerry; and can he state when the Board will be prepared to construct this road.

MR. BIRRELL: The proposed road was inspected in September, 1907, by the engineer of the Congested Districts Board, who reported that only seven families would derive much benefit from it, and that it would probably cost considerably more than £600. The Board decided in December last that, if the county authorities agreed to undertake the work, they would consider what contribution they could make. They are not prepared to construct the road themselves.

Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when he proposes to take the Report stage of the Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill; and will he give adequate time for its full discussion on Report.

MR. BIRRELL: Having regard to the expressions of opinion which have reached me from hon. Members from Ireland sitting both above and below the gangway, the only chance of the Bill becoming law this session seems to depend upon the acceptance of an Amendment making the adoption of the provisions of the Bill as to compulsory notification optional with each local authority. Personally, I think the Bill, even subject to this condition, worth saving, but the matter is under consideration.

Branchfield Grazing Farm, Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to theLord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Branchfield grazing farm situate near Coolaney, County Sligo, and held in fee by Mr. McKim, 3, Carnew Street, South Circular Road, Dublin, has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners; whether an inspector has been sent to value this farm, and, if so, what is the nature of his report; will a sale of this farm take place; and, if so, will he state whether the claims of the subtenants on this estate, whose average valuations do not exceed £3 10s. will receive first consideration in the event of the distribution of this ranch for the relief of congestion.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that these lands have been inspected, but Mr. McKim's interest therein does not appear to be sufficient to enable him to sell the lands under the Land Purchase Acts.

Ballinaraw Evicted Tenant.

Mr. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Estates Commissioners have decided that Richard Foy, whose father was evicted from a farm in Ballinaraw, Bunninadden, County Sligo, is a fit person to be provided with a holding, will he say what steps, if any, are being taken to have him so provided.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have referred this case to their inspector, with a view to providing the applicant with a holding.

Rathmagurry Evicted Tenant.

Mr. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain the cause of the delay in the reinstatement of Pat Kilroy, of Rathmagurry, near Curry, County Sligo, who was evicted from his farm on the Knox estate on 9th June, 1902; and whether, seeing that the tenant in occupation is now and has for some time past been prepared to accept the terms of compensation, namely £50, offered by the Estates Commissioners for surrendering this farm, steps will immediately be taken to have the evicted tenant reinstated.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that this case is under consideration, but, as they are at present advised, there appears to be a legal difficulty about their acquiring the holding under the Evicted Tenants Act. Further inquiries will be made.

Land Purchase in County Armagh.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of purchase agreements under the Irish Land Act, 1903, lodged with the Estates Commissioners up to 31st October last from the County of Armagh, with the total number of advances applied for in connection with these agreements, the number of agreements from Armagh completed, and the total amount actually advanced at the date named.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that up to 31st October last, agreements for the purchase of 13,505 holdings in County Armagh had been lodged, representing a purchase money of £2,629,181. Of this amount there had been advanced on that date £848,903 for the purchase of 3,484 holdings.

Turbary on the King-Harman Estate.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the total area of the turbary on the King-Harman estate, County Roscommon, vested in trustees for the benefit of the tenants, and what is the area of bog on the holding of G. Acheson, who was decided by the Court of Appeal to be entitled to the exclusive right to turbary on the holding sold to him by the Estates Commissioners, to the exclusion of some persons who had previously cut turf thereon under annual permits from the landlord; and what was the average number of the persons allowed to cut on the bog on Acheson's farm.

Mr. BIRRELL: With regard to the turbary on this estate, I would refer the hon. Member to the reply I have just given to a Question asked by the hon. Member for North Roscommon. The area of bogs vested in trustees for the benefit of the tenant purchasers is 1,308 acres. George Acheson's holding comprises 163 acres, and includes a considerable area of heather-covered bog. The Estates Commissioners understand that the vendor formerly licensed about forty persons to take turf from Acheson's bog, about one-third of these persons being tenants on the King-Harman estate.

Shannon Bridge at Portumna.

Mr. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to an inquiry relative to the necessity of building a new bridge across the Shannon, at Portumna, between the county of Galway and county of Tipperary, or repairing the existing bridge and thus avoiding a considerable amount of expense; whether he is aware that one of the members of the Commission sitting to decide the question is Mr. John Ouseley Moynan, county surveyor, of North Tipperary, who has already drawn up and furnished to the County Council of North Tipperary a Report dated March, 1908, in which he insists on the absolute necessity of building a new bridge as aforesaid; that the majority of the Commission, as at present constituted, are paid officers of County Tipperary and County Galway, being the counties primarily responsible for the cost of a new bridge (if any); and will he say whether such majority will have the power of imposing part of the expense of erecting such new bridge on neighbouring counties such as Clare, Limerick, King's and Queen's, who have no representatives on the Commission.

Mr. BIRRELL: A Commission has been appointed at the request of the County Council of North Tipperary to consider the question of building a new bridge at Portumna, the county surveyor having reported that the existing bridge is in a dangerous condition. The county surveyors of the North and South Ridings of Tipperary and of the East Riding of Galway have been placed on the Commission, the other members being Mr. Doyle, K.C., chairman, and Mr. Griffith, engineer to the Dublin Port and Docks Board. The Statute under which the Commission was appointed limits the number to five. It was, therefore, impossible to include representatives of all the counties mentioned in the Question, and an equitable selection has been made. It is one of the duties of the Commission to recommend the area of charge, but any county dissatisfied with such recommendation can appeal to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council.

Loughrea Police.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether all the land in the neighbourhood of Kilrecle, Loughrea, has been sold to the tenants through the Estates Commissioners; whether the district is perfectly crimeless; and whether the Government will consider the propriety of reducing the number of policemen in the district to a normal level.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that more than one property in the neighbourhood of Kilrecle is still unsold. The two extra policemen who are stationed at Kilrecle are still required for the protection of person and the prevention of cattle-driving, and it would be premature at present to consider the question of withdrawing them.

Whyte Blake Estate, Loughrea.

Mr. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that agreements to purchase their residential holdings, have been signed by the tenants on the Whyte Blake estate, Holly Park Loughrea; whether the Estates Commissioners have already distributed the untenanted lands of the estate amongst the small holders; whether the tenants on most of the neighbouring estates are similarly circumstanced; and can he state when it is proposed to disband the military garrison stationed in the middle of the estate.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the tenanted lands on this estate have been sold by the landlord to the tenants. The offer of the Commissioners for the purchase of the untenanted land has been accepted and a scheme for its allotment is being prepared. There are, however, other circumstances connected with the locality which render the retention of the extra police absolutely necessary. I am not aware of any military garrison in the district.

Surety Prisoners in Irish Gaols.

Sir WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the Chief

Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can give details as to the prison treatment of persons committed in default of providing sureties for good behaviour for the offence of cattle-driving, under the heads : Prison uniform, dietary, correspondence, visits, exercises ; association ; remission of sentences ; and punishments.

Mr. BIRRELL : Prisoners of the class referred to in the Question are treated in Ireland as untried prisoners. For the special rules governing their treatment I would refer the hon. Member to the Rules for Ordinary Prisons in Ireland, published as Parliamentary Papers in 1902 (H.C. Papers 129 and 189 of 1902) The details could not well be compressed within the limits of an oral Answer.

Irish Poor Law Returns.

Mr. KAVANAGH (Carlow) : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that several officers of Poor Law unions in Ireland have applied for remuneration for the preparation of Returns which they were required to furnish by sealed order of the Local Government Board for the purposes of the English Royal Commission on Poor Law ; whether such application has been refused by the Treasury ; and whether, in consequence, such expenses have to be paid out of the local rates.

Mr. BIRRELL : I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a Question on the same subject asked by the hon. Member for South Wexford on the 26th instant.

Deportation of Paupers to Ireland.

Mr. KAVANAGH : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that paupers can be deported from Great Britain to Ireland on magistrates' warrants, to be supported and maintained by Irish ratepayers ; whether he is aware that such a case has recently occurred in Carlow, where a pauper has been sent from England to the Carlow workhouse, giving his birthplace as Leighlinbridge, whereas no one of the name has ever been known in the locality ; and whether he will instruct magistrates in this country to make more investigation before issuing a warrant for deportation.

Mr. BIRRELL : My attention has been called to the case referred to. As I have stated on previous occasions the question of amending the law regarding the removal of paupers will be considered when legislation is being introduced for the reform of the Poor Law. I have no power to give instructions to magistrates in England or Scotland.

Sligo, Leitrim, and Northern Counties Railway.

Mr. F. MEEHAN : I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that in the Public Works Loan Bill introduced by the Government in last session of Parliament provisions were made for a free grant of £32,909 to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, on behalf of the Sligo, Leitrim, and Northern Counties Railway Company, and having regard to the fact that this railway is not managed in accordance with public opinion in the counties through which it runs, inquiries will be made regarding the same before sanctioning this grant.

Mr. HOBHOUSE : The grant in question was simply the formal remission of arrears of interest due on a loan in accordance with an arrangement made in 1896, when the affairs of the company were settled under a reconstruction scheme. The remission was confirmed by the Public Works Loans Act of this session, and the transaction is thereby closed. In these circumstances the course suggested by the hon. Member is impracticable.

Killea Post Office.

Mr. C. MACVEIGH (Donegal,E.) : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the proposed removal of the Post Office from Killea, East Donegal, into the County Derry, to the inconvenience of the people now served by it ; whether he is aware that the proposed change would only benefit a few at the cost of the bulk of the people having to walk long distances to post and obtain their letters ; and whether he will take immediate steps to keep the office in the hands of the same family and in the same place, where it has given general satisfaction for years, and prevent an injustice being done to Donegal in order to serve Derry.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON : The necessary inquiries regarding the candidates for the vacant sub-office at Killea have not yet been completed. In selecting a new sub-postmaster, due regard will be given to the position of the premises offered. In the circumstances I can hold out no hope that a member of the family of the late sub-postmistress will be appointed.

Portumna Postal Service.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the town of Portumna, County Galway, is at present without a mid-day mail, while small towns in its vicinity of not more than one-fourth its population have the advantage of one; whether it takes four days to convey newspapers per parcel post from Ennis to Portumna; has he received resolutions from public bodies calling his attention to this matter; and what steps he proposes to take.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON : An application on this subject has been received and is now under inquiry.

Queen Anne's Bounty Board.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that a Select Committee reported in 1901 that the Queen Anne's Bounty Board and the Ecclesiastical Commission might advantageously be united so as to effect a saving of money estimated by the then Archbishop of Canterbury at £20,000 to £30,000 per annum, he will consider the desirability of taking steps, at the first convenient opportunity, to carry out the recommendation of the Committee.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I am aware that the Select Committee of 1901 reported generally in favour of the amalgamation of the Queen Anne's Bounty Board and the Ecclesiastical Commission, and that a Bill to carry this into effect was introduced in 1902, but subsequently dropped. The question is, no doubt, one deserving serious attention, but in view of more pressing matters which will have to be dealt with I can give no undertaking that the Government will introduce a measure on the subject.

The Peers and Government Bills.

MR. HENRY (Shropshire, Wellington): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if, after recent and previous experiences, in order that the time and energy of Members of this House may not be devoted to consideration of Bills after the Second Reading before it is ascertained whether the House of Lords accept the principles of the provisions of Bills introduced in this House, he will consider the desirability of endeavouring to make necessary arrangements that the Committee and subsequent stages of Bills that have received a Second Reading in this House be deferred until such measures have received a Second Reading in the House of Lords.

MR. ASQUITH: My hon. friend has made a very novel proposal, to which, as at present advised, I should hesitate to assent.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Could not the Government easily find out what the action of the House of Lords would be by asking the Leader of the Opposition?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Lado Enclave.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if, having regard to the position that has arisen in the Lado enclave, and to the mischief that has followed on the withdrawal of troops of the Congo Free State, he will consider the advisability of transferring the management of the enclave, subject to the lease to the King of the Belgians, to the Colonial Office, so that it may be administered with the East African Protectorate and Uganda.

MR. ASQUITH: The Agreement of 9th May, 1906, between Great Britain and the Independent State of the Congo provides that on the termination of occupation of the Lado enclave by His Majesty King Leopold II., the territory shall be handed over within six months to the Soudanese Government. His Majesty's Government do not propose to alter that arrangement.

MR. FELL: Have not the Colonial Office the better machinery for administering such territory?

MR. ASQUITH: The territory will be handed over as soon as circumstances permit.

Trawling Prevention Bill.

MR. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the near approach of the end of the session, he will state when the Second Reading and subsequent stages of the Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill will be taken.

MR. CATHCART WASON: At the same time may I ask the Prime Minister if he can now state if the Prevention of Trawling in Prohibited Areas Bill will be pressed this year, or if it will be deferred till next session; and, in view of its importance not only to Scottish interests but to the credit of the country, if it will receive a prominent place in His Gracious Majesty's speech.

MR. ASQUITH: I am afraid that I cannot add anything to the statement that I made on this matter on the 19th, but I may add that I hope to be able to make a statement as to the future course of public business some time next week.

The Education Bill.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked the Prime Minister whether further negotiations were proceeding between him and the Archbishop of Canterbury in relation to the Education Bill, and if so whether the House would be informed of the result.

MR. ASQUITH: The only correspondence that has taken place has already appeared in the public Press.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): May I ask the Prime Minister whether it would be convenient to him, either to-day or later, to make a general statement as to the Business of the House. The right hon. Gentleman postponed last week a general statement until he knew the decision of the House of Lords in regard to the Licensing Bill. I imagine that the decision of the House of Lords is now generally known; and that being so, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman may now be prepared to make the general statement which he promised.

MR. ASQUITH: That element of uncertainty has been removed; but I should prefer to defer my statement a little time.

LORDS AND COMMONS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to give notice that on an early day I shall move the following Resolution, "That having regard to the fact that serious questions affecting the working of the Parliamentary system have arisen from the differences between the two Houses, the time has now come for dealing with the position and composition of the House of Lords, either by the initiation of legislation for the purpose, or by the exercise of the Royal prerogative to withhold the issue of writs of summons to Peers of the realm to attend Parliament, on the advice of Ministers responsible to the House of Commons and through the House of Commons to the people, or by both methods, so as to secure that the accident of birth shall no longer afford rights of controlling the legislation of a free and self-governing people."

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No. 2) BILL.

*MR. SPEAKER said the instructions to the Committee, appearing on the Paper in the names of the hon. Members for the Walton division of Liverpool and North-West Manchester, were out of order.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

*THE CHAIRMAN said the first Amendment on the Paper, in the name of the hon. Member for East Mayo, should come in after the word "authority" in line 6 instead of at the beginning of the clause.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that unless the words he proposed were inserted at the beginning of the clause, it would probably be impossible to raise the question as between contracting-out and coming into the national system for the Catholic schools. If the Amendment was put down to come in after the word "authority," it could not be discussed, as the Amendments preceding that word were so important that they would fully occupy the time at the disposal of the Committee. He would respectfully urge that, unless the Chairman's sense was very strong that the words were out of order at the beginning of the clause, he should not deprive him of the opportunity to move them now; otherwise they would be prevented from raising what to them was the supreme issue of the Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Committee was acting under an order made by the House, and he had no responsibility for that order, except to see that it was carried out. The reason why the Amendment could not be allowed at the beginning of the clause was that it was a rule of Committee debates that an Amendment could not be proposed to insert words at the commencement of a clause with a view to proposing an alternative scheme to that in the clause. It was obvious that if that were allowed, they might never get to the clause at all.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the Amendment his hon. friend did not propose an alternative scheme; it only proposed an exception to the general scheme contained in the clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN said there was no question but that it was a separate scheme from the point of view of a Committee debate.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow), in moving the omission of subsection (1), said the reason he had put down the Amendment was that he could not see why what were called the provided schools should not have just as much right to have money from the rates as any other schools. Indeed, he thought they had a little more right because those who provided the schools had saved the State a lot of money by building the schools and finding the money to carry them on. Therefore, if any schools ought to have rate aid, surely those were the schools. Under this clause they were penalising the very people who had helped the State and who had done for education what the State never did in the old days, and he could not help thinking that instead of disallowing their payment from the rates they should have a fair system, and that, at all events, those denominations who had already helped education ought certainly to have their fair share of the rates. Until they got a fair settlement of this question on those lines, this education difficulty would never be settled.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out subsection (1)."—(*Mr. Hunt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'an elementary school' stand part of the clause."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) said the hon. Member must be quite well aware that the Government could not accept the Amendment. If it were carried it would leave the denominational schools on the rates now exactly as they were at present. Any arrangement entered into was subject to the condition that the denominational schools should not be rate-aided, and he doubted whether the object of the hon. Gentleman would be carried out even if his Amendment were agreed to. The corollary of rate-aid was obviously local public control, and he did not think the hon. Gentleman wished that to be applied to the schools with which he was more immediately associated. The Amendment raised the whole question that had been debated in times past, and was indeed the basis of the compromise. He could not, therefore, see his way to accept the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the right hon. Gentleman had not surprised any of them in not accepting the Amendment. He quite agreed that he could not accept it. It raised the general question of the whole Bill, and it gave an occasion, of which he thought the Committee should take advantage, of really arriving at some clear idea of the present condition of affairs. The right hon. Gentleman talked of the compromise which had been arrived at, and the Prime Minister on a previous day said the Bill could only pass as an agreed Bill. It was because the House had been led to think by the Government and by other speakers that this was an agreed Bill, in the words of the Prime Minister, and an agreed compromise, in the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education, that it received the degree of favour which it did receive in the Second Reading debate and that the benches he was now addressing were relatively so thinly occupied. The Members of that House undoubtedly had got the impression, rightly or wrongly that they were discussing a measure upon which very eminent ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Church of England, of the Church of Rome, and of the Nonconformist bodies had been consulted. That was the impression under which the House had consented in the first place to pass the Second Reading and, in the second place, to submit to closure by compartments. That was the view. Was it the correct view? He thought they were really bound a little to press the Government upon this point. The Prime Minister, in answer to a question that afternoon, had said that there was no more correspondence than that which had appeared in the Press between the Archbishop and the Government. He wished distinctly to understand how the matter stood between the Government and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and between the Government and those with whom they had been in communication, and who represented the Roman Catholic Church. When the Prime Minister said there was no further correspondence since last Thursday, was it to be understood that since then the Archbishop of Canterbury had made no representation to the Government on the subject of this Bill? If the Archbishop had not—he wished specifically to put this question—did the right hon. Gentleman interpret his silence as meaning that he was content with the financial proposal for schools and the arrangements for transfer and maintenance? As the hon. Member for Mayo had said, when Clause 1 was passed the Committee would be committed absolutely to the destruction of voluntary schools; they would go beyond recall so far as the Committee was concerned when subsection (1) of Clause 1 was passed. Surely, then, the Committee ought to know if the parties to the compromise or arrangement were content with the terms upon which the schools were to go. It must be clear to every member of the Committee that the Government had no right to consider the Bill as an agreed Bill unless the compromise covered all the questions lying behind the clause. What would be their position if they found during the next three days, in the course of the operation of the closure, that upon the points upon which the compromise was supposed to be arranged the arrangements were unsatisfactory? It was not an unreasonable question to ask the right hon. Gentleman to tell the Committee in explicit categorical terms how the incomplete correspondence with the Archbishop had terminated; whether the agreement which had not been arrived at when the correspondence came to a conclusion had been now arrived at; if not, what was the nature of the hitch, and whether it was a difficulty which should induce the Committee to hesitate to pass sub-clause (1) as part of an agreed Bill. Also, he asked if the Roman Catholic Church was contented with the arrangement that had been come to with regard to contracting-out schools. These were reasonable questions to ask and answer there and then, and unless there was a clear and explicit statement it was not legitimate for the right hon. Gentleman to talk of an accepted compromise, and for the Prime Minister to speak of this as an agreed Bill. He pressed the matter no further at the moment, but awaited with anxiety what the right hon. Gentleman had to say.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) thought the right hon. Gentleman would have replied at once to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, but as he was going to defer his answer he would like to ask him to develop, if he could, what fell from the Prime Minister on Friday last in reference to the position of the Catholic contracted-out schools under the Bill. It was quite clear, as had been pointed out, that owing to the Chairman's ruling on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Mayo, when the Committee passed Clause 1 under the closure at half-past ten o'clock, then, so far as contracting-out schools were concerned, the question would be settled. The Prime Minister intimated on Friday that the question of grants to contracting-out schools was still an open question, and by so saying, as he understood Parliamentary phraseology, the Prime Minister intimated that the scheduled grants as they now stood in the Bill would be raised. Before the Committee came to a decision upon this part of Clause 1 it was only fair they should be told what was to be the amount to be given to the contracting-out schools. If they were not given that information then it would seem the Government were following the same course they had pursued with the Archbishop of Canterbury and which had led to the difficulty in which the Prime Minister now found himself. For reasons best known to himself the right hon. Gentleman avoided in his correspondence and conversation with the Archbishop letting the latter know what the grants were going to be. Even when the Archbishop was sent a draft of the Bill the amount was left blank in the Bill. Were they now going to be treated in the same way? If so, it was not courteous; it was not fair to the House; and, on behalf of his co-religionists, he asked to be informed before proceeding further what grants were to be proposed for the contracted-out schools.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square), as one who had voted for the Second Reading of the Bill, earnestly asked for an answer to the question. He had not the opportunity in a few moments on the Second Reading to give his reason why he was disinclined to stand in the way of a settlement; but as he had said publicly since, his vote was given subject to the reservation that the right of entry should be further safeguarded, and that Amendments to the contracting-out and transfer clauses should be of a very substantial character. He further had said, and he repeated, that he would not give up the position he had taken in voting for the Second Reading, unless satisfied that the rights of Roman Catholics were safeguarded; that was a question of honour and equity. It was a matter of the gravest importance, before deciding on this clause, to know exactly what the position was, whether an agreement had been arrived at with the Church of England, Nonconformists, and Roman Catholics. He most earnestly trusted that some further light would be thrown upon this matter.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he was sure there would be no desire that he should make a Second Reading speech on every Amendment, but he would be glad to give such information as was asked for. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition seemed to be under some misapprehension. When he last spoke the Prime Minister said this was not to be treated as a treaty between high contracting parties, and the Government had not diverged from their position; they thought they had arrived at common ground upon which they could proceed, and that common ground was that there should be no rate aid to any school not under public control and management. That principle was clear from the outset, it was in the letter from the Prime Minister to the Primate, it was made the first condition and not objected to, and was part of the agreement. The right hon. Gentleman asked if there was any further correspondence since the letter between the Government and the Archbishop of Canterbury. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had seen the letters between the Archbishop and the Prime Minister published on Saturday. Perhaps he had better read a passage from the Prime Minister's letter—

> "We are not only willing but anxious to hear and consider any criticisms you may have to offer on the schedules as they at present stand. Mr. Runciman will very gladly accept your offer of a conference with expert assistance. It would, however, facilitate matters if in advance you would kindly have sent to him a statement

in outline (not, of course, in detail) of any specific objections to the proposed scale and of any counter-proposal which you may wish to formulate."

When they came to these subjects they would be treated with every consideration, and the Government would do what they could to show that their proposals were perfectly reasonable, absolutely fulfilling the undertaking of the Prime Minister that the contracted-out schools should have a reasonable chance of existence. They would be able to show when they came to that stage that they had made full and ample provision for contracted-out schools. The transfer of schools they would treat in exactly the same way, and he would be able to give good grounds, not only in theory, but in practice, for the belief that their terms were fair and just. He altogether deprecated discussions of either of the Schedules on the first subsection. They would have full time for discussing them. On Wednesday they had put down the Report stage of the Financial Resolution, when he hoped to make a fuller statement on the finances of the Bill. They had increased the number of days for the Committee stage so that both Schedules might come under full discussion, and there was no reason to believe that out of that discussion they would not come fully justified.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) wished to say with very great respect, for they all knew the great courtesy with which the President of the Board of Education had handled this difficult matter, that the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the question of the Leader of the Opposition. He had referred to the Schedules and to Clause 2, and had said that he hoped and believed that the financial terms of the Schedule providing sums for the contracted-out schools and the administrative terms of the clause would, when reached, be considered satisfactory by the Committee. That was not an answer to the question whether the Government had arrived at a complete understanding with the Archbishop of Canterbury and those who spoke for the Roman Catholics upon whether the terms would be considered by them as adequate, effective, and full. They could not pass subsection (1) of Clause 1 until they had an answer to that question. The point was not whether the Government thought their terms adequate, but whether they could say that those who spoke for the Church of England and the Roman Catholics thought them adequate. Otherwise it would not be an agreed Bill and they must look at this subsection as if it was the beginning of a Bill introduced under ordinary circumstances. In view of the silence with which the right hon. Gentleman had met his right hon. friend's question, they saw at once that the subsection was the foundation of the whole Bill. The President of the Board of Education said that it was one of the items on which an agreement had been arrived at, but it was not an item at all, but the foundation of the whole scheme. It was only an item if agreement had been reached on all the other items—the terms for contracted-out schools, the transfer of Church schools in single-school areas, and the right of entry in county council schools. Being a foundation, it was obvious that it would determine both the shape and stability of everything super-imposed upon it. When they voted at half-past ten that night for the clause they would definitely give up one system of national education for another.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: So far as the Committee is concerned.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, so far as this House was concerned. Unless on the Report stage they diametrically reversed the view they took in Committee, so far as this House was concerned, they would substitute for the existing system a system which educational experts told them would be less efficient and which financial experts told them would be more expensive. Under ordinary circumstances everybody would agree that the House of Commons would feel it its duty to examine such provisions with minute care and somewhat prolonged deliberation; but none of them would pretend that they were discussing the question under ordinary circumstances. They were discussing it under somewhat extraordinary and, he thought, extra-constitutional conditions. They had been told by the newspapers that this item embodied the upshot of the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Primate of the Established Church. Did it embody that? Had they reached a conclusion? Until they knew that, what was the use of referring them to the newspapers of the country? It might be that thanks to the good offices of the Prime Minister and the Primate they were relieved of their functions and had no duty to perform. That seemed to be the view of the Government, because, as they had had no opportunity of collecting the opinion of their constituents, it was evident that they were not in a position to perform the duties that generally deolved upon them. They were invited by the Minister for Education—he would not say commanded, as he did not wish to import heat into the debate—simply to signify their assent to an agreement which the official heads of the political and ecclesiastical institutions of the country had almost, if they had not quite, arrived at. In response to that invitation they were entitled to ask whether they had arrived, or had almost arrived, and, certainly, whether they were sure to arrive, at an agreement. If there was any doubt about that, the whole case for passing Clause 1 as an item of compromise fell to the ground. It was suggested that if the Prime Minister and the Primate did not quite understand each other then all misunderstandings would be cleared up in another place. Was he to understand that they were to march into the lobby when the guillotine fell and that all outstanding differences of the most fundamental character were to be adjusted by the Lords spiritual and temporal? Was that the view of the supporters of the Government? Since that was the very minor *role* allocated to the House of Commons he thought that they ought to be very graceful to the Prime Minister for having allowed them a whole day in which to signify their formal assent and to put their mark on an instrument of policy on which the Prime Minister and the Primate might possibly agree. The first Minister of the Crown and the Archbishop of Canterbury had done their work for them. It was quite like the old times. They were back in the Middle Ages. But even then the rude representatives of the people were permitted to take the liberty of asking a few questions, and he would ask the Minister for Education three questions [Cries of "Oh."] Was that too much? Their right to debate ended at half-past ten; was it too much to ask three questions on a Bill of this magnitude? His first was whether it was a fact that, if they passed this subsection now, contracted-out schools were a necessary consequence. Was it a fact that they would adopt contracting-out into the national educational system? They knew what the result of the division would be. The battalion opposite was very well drilled and observed silence in the ranks. Very few would speak; fewer would listen; and all would march into the "Aye" lobby. So it was not hypothetical, but if they passed the subsection they would have adopted, after one day's debate, contracting-out as part of the national system. If that was so, they knew where they were. Then he asked his second question. Would not that impose a very considerable burden upon the taxpayers, who would have to provide the Parliamentary grant to support these contracted-out schools; and would it not, under subsection (3) of the clause, impose a very large burden on the ratepayers who were invited to run rate-aided schools in competition against the taxpayers' schools? Was it not clear that if they passed the subsection they were going to embarrass the financial position of the country? His third question was whether the Minister for Education had made any attempt to estimate the cost put on the taxpayers and ratepayers if they passed the subsection with all the consequences it entailed. If the subsection was passed, it was perfectly clear that they would be committed to contracting-out on a large scale and to a large increase of the education grant, along with, in all probability, equivalent grants for that purpose, or another purpose, in Scotland and Ireland. That was clear, but what was not clear was why it should be done. It would have been quite clear if the Minister of Education had been able and willing to answer his right hon. friend. If the right hon. Gentleman had been able, he was quite sure that he would have been willing to answer his right hon. friend. If this was an agreed Bill, an accepted compromise, then the answer would be that they asked the House to pass subsection (1) Clause 1 in the hope of peace. But if the right hon. Gentleman was not able to give that assurance what possible reason could there be to ask the House to divide the national system of education into two conflicting parts, and to place great burdens on the taxpayers and on the ratepayers in order to introduce separate kinds of schools running in competition with each other? Perhaps by so doing the Government would discover another method of relieving unemployment. There was little hope for peace unless the Minister for Education could reply satisfactorily to his right hon. friend. He himself was sorry for it. When the State announced that in future it would stamp its approval on only one form of religious instruction in a country which had hitherto been famous for the vigour and variety of its religious convictions, what great hope was there of peace? Unless the Minister for Education could say that this was an agreed Bill, an accepted compromise, the hope of peace became less and less; and it had been extinguished by the conditions under which they were asked to welcome this measure, because they were asked by the closure Resolution really to abandon their position under the Constitution and to accept an approximate agreement between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Prime Minister to be reviewed or ratified, if reviewed or ratified at all, not there but in the House of Lords.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said that the obvious meaning of this clause was that no rate aid of any kind was to be given to any schools except those of a certain character. It was notorious that all the Roman Catholic schools in the country declined to take to themselves that character, and therefore the House was proposing that no rate aid should be given to any Roman Catholic schools. That was, he maintained, an essentially unjust proposition, however many archbishops or bishops had agreed to it. He did not think that anyone on that side of the House denied that the Roman Catholics paid rates for the support of schools to which it was admitted that they could not send their children, and therefore they had an absolute claim in equity to a refund of a proportionate share of the rates for the support of schools to which they could send their children. There never had been an attempt to answer that argument. The plausible excuse had occasionally been given that if this argument were applied to education they might apply it to battleships and free libraries. But surely the distinction was very great. They built battleships for common national purposes, but they had not yet come to the point of deciding that there was one common national religion to which every citizen in this country was bound to conform. At any rate, he hoped not. But if there was not a common national religion to which they were all bound to conform, he had a right to say to one section of the community: "If you take my money for your schools, I have a right to ask for a share of your money for my schools." He held this proposition, apart from the question of putting the schools in an efficient condition. He held it on the ground of financial honesty. That being so, if the Government proceeded on the principle of refusing rate aid to voluntary schools, they were bound to make that loss good out of State aid. Personally he had never been able to appreciate this great mystery of the distinction between rate aid and State aid. In various parts of the world there were various strange creeds supported by the State, but never before had people been found willing to maintain as an article of faith, for which they would fight to their last gasp, that there was an eternally sacred distinction between rates and taxes. Yet that was the proposition which seemed to be put forward now. He hoped that hon. Members opposite would not fall into the same folly and insist on having actual rate aid for their schools when they could get a proportional contribution from the Imperial Exchequer. He readily admitted that they were right in objecting to a fixed Exchequer grant, for the fixed Exchequer grant took no account whatever of the variable cost of education in different places, or of its tendency to increase.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he thought that the hon. Gentleman was not in order to go into these details at the present stage, although he might refer generally to the financial effect of contracting-out.

*MR. HAROLD COX said that he did not object to contracting-out. He was one of the few Members of the House who actually believed in contracting-out. Two years ago he proposed an Amendment in favour of it and hon. Gentleman opposite, both above and below the gangway, voted for it although they now explained that they did so not believing in it. On that occasion the Government voted against his Amendment, yet now they had embodied it in their Bill. Whether they believed in it or not he should not care to guess. Personally he believed that contracting-out was the only possible solution of this difficulty, and that they would never get real liberty for the schools of the country except by freeing them from local control. His hon. friends opposite said that they objected to contracting-out because it would put the Catholic schools outside the national system of education. That was a very attractive phrase, but did it really mean anything? Were not Eton and Harrow as much part of our national system of education as the schools maintained by the Borough Council of West Ham? Before the Committee adopted this clause it ought to be made perfectly clear that the Government did propose to take account of the difference in the cost of schools in different areas, and to provide for the progressive increase of the cost of elementary education in the council schools.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.) thought it would be necessary for every Roman Catholic to support the Amendment. They regretted this, because there were many of them, certainly all of them who took any interest and part in the public life of the country, who recognised clearly that the attempt which was being made to make a settlement of this vexed education question was a genuine one and was the outcome of a great deal of energy on the part of the Minister for Education. He acknowledged that in framing this subsection of the Bill, the Board of Education believed that they must accept the only alternative offered to the Catholics. But he respectfully submitted that they had not taken sufficient steps to find out whether the Catholics could accept it or another. The Catholics, as the House knew, numbered from five to seven per cent. of the population of the country. They were so concentrated in numbers that their particular position in the community did not make them indeed the dominant party, but their vote very largely influenced elections in such districts as his own constituency of Salford and in Manchester, Bradford, Liverpool, and some districts of London. He submitted that that point of view was not sufficiently studied in the hurried communications which had taken place with the heads of the Catholic party at the last moment.

MR. RUNCIMAN said that his hon. friend was under a complete misapprehension. Both his predecessors were in full communication and touch with the highest dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, both in the summer and in the autumn.

MR. BELLOC said he knew as a fact that the predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman and, even more, the predecessor of his predecessor were in touch with them, but if the Minister for Education was under the impression that he had arrived at some sort of final solution with the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, then he said that personally, and other members of that Church and the whole hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, disagreed with him. The unanimity on this matter was very different from the diverse feelings which existed when the Bill of the present Chief Secretary for Ireland was under discussion; and that unanimity, if it existed, made it dangerous for the future progress of this Bill. He wanted to explain why the feeling that this clause was unreasonable existed amongst many of the members of other religious communities than the Catholic or the Anglican. His hon. friend the Member for Preston said that when contracting-out was proposed two years ago the Irish Party, or at any rate the Catholic

Members of that Party, voted for it. They voted for it as the lesser of two evils in a Bill of the most drastic kind, proposed if he might say so, as a weapon of offence. This Bill was not of that character. This Bill had the character of a final compromise and was put forward indeed, almost as non-contentious. The other was described, in a military metaphor as a sword. What was more, they opposed contracting-out because there was very considerable danger —he used the word danger advisedly— of this compromise becoming law. They all saw the conversation which took place on the front Opposition bench when another place was alluded to, but he did not think that that other place, which was already waking up to the mistake it had made in the last few days, was going to make another mistake, and he was not aware that Lord Rothschild possessed any debentures or monetary interest, and, therefore, he did not think he would enter into this matter. He did not think it would concern those things the noble Lord thought most important, and it was on that account and because some of the Anglican episcopacy and many men of various parties in this House were agreed upon this compromise —it was because it was the more likely to become law that the more strenuously should they oppose the propositions which it contained. They could not accept the position of inferiors receiving a smaller amount than their fellow citizens, while they paid the same taxes, and if schools were to be established in this country under what he believed was its national religion— [Cries of "What is it?"]—Cowper-Templeism—and if Catholics were to be treated as exceptional people who must be fined for holding a religion of somewhat greater antiquity and with somewhat sharper definitions, they would resist it in this House, they would resist it when or if the Bill became law, and— he knew the gravity of saying this, but he might say it with perfect justice— he believed that in making such a proposition the Government would create a position not only untenable in logic, but unworkable in practice.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said the only comment he would make upon the speech of the hon. Member for South Salford was to protest that Cowper-Templeism, whatever that might mean, was not the national religion, unless it was true, as he believed an interesting writer had said, that religion was dead in this country. As to the Amendment, the right hon. Gentleman in his answer said that the Bill was not an agreement and repeated what had been said before by speakers on the Treasury bench, but he did not think he meant himself to be taken quite seriously. Nobody in the Committee supposed that the Bill would ever have been introduced unless the Government had been able to flourish before the House something in the nature of an agreement which they had arrived at with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Everybody knew that that was the foundation on which the Bill rested, and he thought that was clear from the right hon. Gentleman's own speech, because he went on to say that the Archbishop never objected to this subsection, which was an essential part of their scheme. He had done his best to read the voluminous correspondence between the Government and the Archbishop which had been published, and he should say that the Archbishop objected in almost every line to this subsection. He said it was a most tremendous sacrifice and was a thing to which he could scarcely ask his fellow-Churchmen to agree. Every argument of the Archbishop was a complete objection to this subsection. The most reverend Prelate said—he did not agree with him—that the other advantages of the Bill were such as to enable him to agree to that subsection. [MINISTERIAL cheers]. Yes, but what were those advantages? One of the chief, which the Archbishop had said was absolutely essential, was still a matter of negotiation. That was why the right hon. Gentleman not only in form but in substance had not answered in any degree the question put to him. The point was quite simple. This had been represented by the Prime Minister and the right hon. Gentleman himself as in the nature of a treaty—[Cries of "No"]—well, as a compromise or a balanced settlement. He did not care about phrases, he was dealing with facts. They were given a balance-sheet by both of the Ministers, and foremost amongst those things which the Church gave up were the matters contained in this subsection. What they wanted to know was what was to be put on the other side of the balance-sheet. The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to assure the House that these items of the balance-sheet had been agreed upon, but it was quite immaterial whether they put anything on the other side. It was like the right hon. Gentleman saying he had agreed to sell a horse and the price did not matter. [" No."] That was precisely the same thing. It was all very well for members of the Nonconformist party to protest against that, but they would find if they examined it that the parallel was an absolutely true one. He had not overlooked the correspondence which was published in Saturday's Papers. Nothing could be more clear than what the Archbishop said. He said that the question of the Schedule was absolutely an essential question. In so many words he said it was essential to the agreement and essential to the settlement they had come to. Therefore it was absolutely absurd to say that when he agreed to this subsection he agreed to it without reference to the terms which the Schedule was to contain. There was one passage in the letters published on Saturday to which he desired to draw the attention of the Committee because it might be the explanation. The Prime Minister said he had purposely put off the Schedule till Tuesday in order to give time for negotiations and discussion. Did that mean that if the negotiations did not result in an agreement the Government would withdraw the Bill? There was no answer at present, but he thought the Committee would be very glad to know that. It was not for him to criticise hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite; it might well be thought it was consistent with the views of a party which was always dneouncing sacerdotalism to try and settle the education question by an agreement with the Archbishop. He did not know how that might be, but they ought to know whether, if an agreement was not arrived at on Tuesday next, the Bill would be withdrawn. He was obliged to ask that question.

*The CHAIRMAN said he really must call the hon. Member to order. He had given him very large latitude, but clearly there must be a limit to the questions asked, and he did not think that which the noble Lord asked came within the scope of the subsection.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR on the point of order said he wished to ask a question. He believed he was right in saying that this Bill was presented as an arrangement in which two sides both gave up something. Something which was given up was represented by the subsection, and what they were anxious to know was whether an arrangement had been come to as to what was to be given up on the other side. He would ask as a point of order whether it was not absolutely necessary before they allowed subsection (1) to pass into the Bill they should know what was the corresponding arrangement on the other side, and could that be excluded from their discussion. It was a very exceptional position of affairs, which justified him in putting a point of order in that particular form.

*The CHAIRMAN said he thought the right hon. Gentleman if he had been in the House would have noticed that he had not pulled up anybody for putting a question of that kind, but now the noble Lord wished to know if the Bill was going to be withdrawn under certain conditions, and he thought that was not allowable.

Lord R. CECIL said he would not repeat what he had said; he was only going to make this one other observation, which he thought the Chairman would allow, that the question of whether an agreement or not was arrived at was really a matter of vital importance to the House in considering whether they would assent to this subsection, and they had to consider, in assuming the probability of such an agreement, this further fact—that they had a statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of Westminster that the terms offered were grossly insufficient. They had the converse statement repeated with great energy by several eminent Nonconformists, that no concession of any further kind would be made to the denominations in question. It would, therefore, seem impossible for the Government to give way or make any further advances in connection with the schedule, and, therefore, they had to take it for the purposes of this discussion that on the terms as they stood the only authority which gave the Government the least right to say that this was a balanced settlement or an agreed Bill had absolutely repudiated the measure as it stood at present, and on that ground, without going into the tremendous sacrifices which this subsection imposed upon the Church, without repeating what he said on the Second Reading as to the total inadequacy of the Bill—on that ground if all the other grounds were swept away, he should feel himself compelled to vote for the Amendment of his hon. friend.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said that in the few observations he had to make, he would not say anything which would make any concession difficult of attainment, and he should not have made any observations at all on the subject before the Committee, if he had not wished to give utterance in the House to the objection which was so very strongly felt, as he believed, with increasing force in Lancashire, a county in which he represented a constituency. He would ask the Committee most earnestly to consider for a moment the wholly exceptional position of Lancashire as far as these proposals were concerned. He did not wish to elaborate or to repeat the points which had already been frequently made in the course of these debates, but the Committee was probably aware that the majority of the children in Lancashire at the present time were being educated in voluntary schools, and taking the population as a whole by any test of homogeneity that could be applied, the denominational system was one which was suited to and warmly appreciated by the great mass of the population throughout this county. That was true of Lancashire, and he wished to draw an analogy for a moment between the state of affairs in Lancashire and the state of affairs throughout the country as far as the Roman Catholics were concerned. Many of his own constituents were Roman Catholics, and held views on this subject which were certainly quite as strong and unimpeachable as those held by Anglicans. This Bill was put forward as an agreed settlement, and as a compromise which it was presumed gave to the Church and the Roman Catholics something more than they would have been able to obtain under previous Bills which they had successfully resisted. If that were not the case put forward it was clear that there would not be any great inducement for this change, which they were resisting by every means in their power, because they believed that if they were to waive their objections and support the present proposal the paradoxical consequence would occur that Lancashire and the Roman Catholic schools would be actually in a worse position under Clause 1 of the present Bill than they were under the Bill of the last Education Minister but one, the Chief Secretary for Ireland. There was in his Bill the safeguard that under certain conditions the rates would be still available for denominational schools, and they were not cut adrift from the national system. Now, they had a much worse Bill, which was put forward as an improvement. So far as Lancashire was concerned, it would not be disputed by any Lancashire Member that the majority of the people there continued to desire that denominational instruction should have recourse to the rates. The Bill, however, said that if they retained that teaching they must be cut adrift from the rates and make heavy sacrifices. In Blackburn they had a denominational school which would cost them £6,000 a year under that Bill.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Has the hon. Member taken into consideration the question of pooling ?

MR. F. E. SMITH said he had not taken that into account in this case, but he was informed, on behalf both of Roman Catholics and of Anglicans, that taking the country as a whole pooling would not introduce any very material qualification of the figures. But even if some reduction were made, the position in Blackburn would be that the people would still have to pay rates in support of teaching of which they disapproved, and to contribute a very large sum in order to retain the privilege of carrying on their own schools. This was the very negation of equality as between the different sects, and he formally gave notice that if the Bill passed there would not be an election in Lancashire at which candidates on both sides would not be asked: "Are you prepared to increase the grant until it coincides with the full total cost of secular education?"

*THE CHAIRMAN said the question of the adequacy of the grant to contracting-out schools did not arise now.

MR. F. E. SMITH said that in his judgment there never would be a settlement upon the terms laid down in the Bill. But if the Government would deal with voluntary schools upon a basis of exact equality, then there would be a permanent settlement. Exact equality meant that there should be a right of entry, and that denominationalists should be treated in precisely the same way as those devoted to Cowper-Temple teaching were treated in the council schools, without any of these almost insulting distinctions.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is making a Second Reading speech. Cowper-Templeism does not arise on this Amendment.

MR. F. E. SMITH submitted that it was impossible to discuss the Amendment unless they considered the terms to be granted to contracting-out schools. As one who had never pretended to be a strong denominationalist, but who had always lived among a community of very strong denominationalists, he predicted that unless the Government recognised that there must be equality of treatment there would be no compromise.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said that all his constituents felt deeply about this Bill. They had not been consulted on the compromise. If they had been they would not have agreed to it in any way. Under it the voluntary schools, Anglican and Catholic, were to be handed over to the local education authorities, and when they remembered that 700,000 children were being educated in the voluntary schools they would agree that the subsection might have a very important and far-reaching effect. By the subsection the managers and trustees of the voluntary schools would be compelled to hand over schools held under charitable trusts which specially laid down that the teaching of the Church of England and no other was to be given in them. Cowper-Temple teaching would be given in them every day by the local education authority, and it would be small comfort to know that denominational religion might be allowed an entry on two days a week. It was a strong order to ask denominational school managers to hand over their schools on such terms. Thousands of the working men of Lancashire had built these schools in order to educate their children in the faith of their parents. Let the Committee consider what their feelings would be. Was there any justice in the proposition that these schools should be handed over and that on two days a week denominational teaching should be given, but on the other five days Cowper-Temple teaching should be given?

*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that that question did not arise on the subsection.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said he was aware of the multifarious duties of the Prime Minister, but he felt obliged to say that he bitterly regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had not found it possible to be present during this discussion. The Bill was of such supreme importance, and so difficult was the task before them, that the Committee really needed the guidance of the right hon. Gentleman during the discussion. He could not help thinking that had the Prime Minister been present, he would have begun to regret that he had insisted upon their proceeding with the Bill with so much rapidity and so little time to consider it. After all, this measure was presented as being the outcome of an understanding between Nonconformist opinion on the one side and Anglican opinion on the other, and that the differences between the parties had been almost bridged. The Prime Minister had stated that the two bodies had come so closely together and the gap between them was so small that it was the duty of the Government itself to step in and bridge it over. What they wanted to know was whether the Prime Minister or the Minister for Education was in a position to say that that statement correctly described the position to-day. He thought that the Prime Minister's statement left out of account the position of the Roman Catholics. At any rate, the passage of the right hon. Gentleman's speech to which he referred did not allude to them. It was confined to the Nonconformists and to the members of the Church of England. But the question with which the debate started and which still remained unanswered, though put by his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, was whether the statement of the Prime Minister correctly represented the position. It might be that he thought it represented the position, but when he used those words the other day, did they correctly represent the position? That the right hon. Gentleman thought they did, they one and all recognised to the full. But they had seen the correspondence which appeared on Saturday in the newspapers, and there was grave reason to doubt that the Government had really brought the two parties so closely together as they thought. Throughout the debate they had seen that those who were accustomed to act together in the closest harmony in that House had found themselves taking different views of this solution, and they all of them had to do the best they could under very difficult circumstances. But surely it was material for them to know whether what was within this Bill offered the means of enduring peace, and also what was the present position of the negotiations. As his noble friend the Member for Marylebone had pointed out, this Bill was not merely as a whole a balanced settlement, but clause was balanced against clause, and, as the Prime Minister himself had pointed out, Clause 1 was the great concession to Nonconformist opinion. It was, therefore, very material to know what was expected to be received in return for what they gave, what it was they were to get elsewhere in the Bill, and what was the price to be paid. They ought to know whether the Archbishop and his friends would receive in the later portions of the Bill the considerations which they thought they were promised when they consented to become parties to this settlement. He pressed for an answer to the question whether the position of the negotiations was as hopeful now as when the Bill was introduced, and whether the grave doubts expressed in the Archbishop's letter on Saturday had been removed in the course of the negotiations since. Might he say one word as to the position of the Roman Catholics? Of course, they knew nothing of what had passed between the Government and the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, but it was evident to anybody who wanted a solution of this question, that the Government had not only to effect a settlement reasonable and satisfactory to Nonconformists and to the members of the Church of England, but also one which would be reasonable and satisfactory to the Roman Catholics also. He regretted that an hon. Member opposite had made an attack upon his noble friend Lord Rothschild which was wholly unnecessary and irrelevant. It was an abuse of the hon. Member's position to make insinuations that seemed all the more reprehensible and all the less pardonable when they recollected that the communion to which Lord Rothschild belonged maintained at considerable expense their own special schools. Any member of the Jewish communion would recognise that the services of Lord Rothschild, with his family, to those schools were such as should protect him against the insinuations of the hon. Member. It was necessary to have a solution, if it was to be enduring, which would be reasonable and satisfactory to all those bodies. But they were asking all who had grave doubts about the possibility of arriving at a settlement, and all who were without knowledge as to the present position of the negotiations on various points, to accept now what was the foundation of the whole scheme. He earnestly desired a settlement, and he put it to the Government whether, by withholding information of this kind, they would really promote the passage of the Bill. He thought that in a matter of this character the Government ought to deal frankly and fully with the House, and play with all the cards on the table.

MR. RUNCIMAN said there was no objection whatever to replying to the inquiries made by both right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and he proposed to answer them in a few words. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire had asked him whether they were as hopeful now as they were last week of arriving at a settlement of this question. He would tell him emphatically that they were. They had no reason to believe the contrary. If either of the right hon. Gentlemen could tell him that he had information from the Archbishop authorising him to say that he did not agree to the passing of this subsection until they had finally closed up in water-tight form every detail and every minor point as respected the amount of grants, the pooling of grants, and the rents, then he could only say that was new information which he received with great apprehension. But he had no ground for believing that anything of the kind existed. The latest knowledge he had led him to believe that the Archbishop was not prepared to destroy the Bill at the present moment because they had not arrived at a complete agreement as to the financial clauses. There was nothing new in the correspondence on Saturday. The Archbishop, when the Government introduced their Bill, stated in his letter the fact that, as regarded the money, he could not give a final reply. There was nothing new in that. The Archbishop had said exactly the same thing before. The Government were going into these details with those who represented the English Church, or they thought represented the English Church, and he hoped that, before they had done with this Bill in the House of Commons, they would be able to state definitely whether the representatives of the Church did or did not agree with the terms of the Bill. But they could only proceed with one subsection at a time, and he was asking the House to do a perfectly justifiable thing, namely, to pass the first subsection, when he said that all outstanding features had been settled, with the exception of the provision in regard to rents, the figures as to the grants, and certain matters of minor interpretation. It would be entirely contrary to the practice of the House to say that they would not take this first subsection because there might be some outstanding features that could be discussed later on, not only on the Committee stage, but on the Report stage. [OPPOSITION cries of "Will they be discussed?"] He ventured to say that these important matters would be discussed on the Report stage, and the Government had no wish to prevent their being discussed on the Report stage.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN pointed out that whilst they could reduce the grants on the Report stage, there was no power, even the Government had not the power, to move an increase of them. He thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to have that in his mind.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he had that in mind. What they were now discussing was the first subsection of Clause 1. The other point raised by the right hon. Gentleman was that if they passed this clause, they would be taking an irrevocable step. He was not asking them to take an irrevocable step. They never took an irrevocable step on the Committee Stage of the Bill. He was not quite sure that, if they gave to the contracting-out schools far more than they did in the schedule, the Leader of the Opposition would even then vote for it, for he understood that the right hon. Gentleman objected to the principles of the Bill as it was framed. All he could say was that they were doing their best to close up the small points, and they ought not to be prevented from getting subsection (1) of this clause, merely because they were now discussing and hoped to agree on other points.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman asked him whether he had any information that the Archbishop was unwilling to pass subsection (1), or was in a mood which would make a settlement of later clauses difficult. It was not he who was in communication with the Archbishop; it was not he who had had correspondence with his Grace; it was not he who was the authorised channel of the Archbishop's views in that House, and he could do no more than give the impression left on his mind by the correspondence. Anybody who had read that correspondence with an impartial eye must be aware that it showed that the Archbishop was deeply disquieted about what the right hon. Gentleman seemed to regard as details of the Bill. They were not details, but essential things as to which the Archbishop said there was to be a settlement. Even some of the speeches made on the other side offered sufficient warning that there might be grave doubts as to whether a settlement really could be arrived at upon this Bill. Let them assume for the sake of argument that they came to terms with the Archbishop. There was still left the question as regarded Roman Catholics. He was perfectly ready to discuss the subsection on those terms but, accepting the premise it was not treating them fairly to suggest that they were now discussing the principles which the Archbishop was anxious or ready to see pass and that other outstanding differences were questions of detail. That was really not so. The right hon. Gentleman said they must deal with each subsection by itself. That was precisely in contradiction to what was said by the Prime Minister and by the right hon. Gentleman himself on the Second Reading. They then said: "You cannot treat these questions by themselves. They are all part of one organic settlement. You cannot pass one without accepting the other. You cannot drop one without affecting the other." Accepting that view of the Bill he asked what was the organic settlement. Was it the Bill as it appeared before them? They knew it was not. They knew that conclusively from the correspondence. They knew that in this organic settlement they could not discuss one fraction without knowing what the other fractions were; it was like a tesselated pavement, each portion of which depended upon the others; they were at all events aware that while there might be agreement that this subsection should pass if the other parts of the Bill were satisfactory, there was no agreement that it should pass if the other subsections were unsatisfactory. The whole correspondence with the Archbishop and the Bishop of London showed that the other integral portions of this balanced arrangement were not settled. When the Government told them that this was an arrangement which must be taken or left as a whole, it was the most plain and obvious corollary that they should know what the whole was of which this subsection was a part. It was not true that the other thing was a matter of detail. It was not true that the amount of money which the Roman Catholics got was a detail. It was not true that the terms on which entry was to be carried out or the terms on which transfer was to take place were details. They were essential and fundamental parts of one big bargain, and while he still, unhappily, had his doubts as to whether even if they carried out the bargain they would have a settlement, everyone admitted that if they did not carry out the bargain they could not have a settlement. It was perfect folly to part with one half of the bargain until they knew what the other half was. That seemed to him so plain and so obvious a fact that common fairness of dealing between the Government and the Committee required them to tell the Committee how they thought they could meet the claims of the Archbishop and the Bishop of London on the one side and the Roman Catholics on the other, before they passed from the subsection. It seemed so plain that he was amazed that hon. Gentlemen opposite did not see the thing in the same light. He was not conscious of having put before them anything in the nature of a paradox. The whole argument of such observations as he had laid before them was based upon the Prime Minister's own declaration that this was a self-contained scheme, indefensible in each of its parts but defensible regarded as a whole. Then they must know the whole, and the Government were most gravely to blame in asking them to discuss any of the parts until they were absolutely assured that the whole was that self-contained, harmonious, and organic unity which alone would justify the House in hoping against hope that it was to be a final settlement of the question.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley) entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken as to the view put by the Prime Minister, namely, that this was a self-contained scheme, and that as a matter of fact it was not a Bill at all, and he did not regard it as a Bill but as a mere bargain. When he heard that, he felt himself totally unable to vote for the Second Reading, because he did not believe in the bargain, and if he had voted for the Second Reading he should not have been free to alter this or the other part of the bargain that did not suit him. He had never felt more humiliated in his life than that afternoon. They had been discussing the Archbishop of Canterbury. He had come there foolishly thinking that it was a Bill. They had had any amount of talk about the Archbishop and occasionally a Catholic Archbishop had been brought in, and on one solitary occasion he believed there was a reference to the Nonconformist leaders. They seemed to have receded into the dim and distant past. The person who was substantial and real was the Archbishop of Canterbury. It would help their debates if the Minister for Education would get a certificate from the Archbishop for each clause that he could read out and then there would be no doubt about it. The other alternative was to give the Archbishop a seat on that bench and then perhaps he would speak for himself. After what the right hon. Gentleman had said, as he understood it, he was still carrying out his bargain. It was always difficult to deal with bishops; when they got to archbishops it was nearly impossible, and when the Archbishop had not made up his mind he was in a dilemma. But the right hon. Gentleman was under an entire misapprehension. Hon. Members had not read the Bill. This was a Bill to make proper provision with respect to elementary education and not elementary religion If they kept to education they would have no need of the Archbishop.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that no one could deny that the clause and the Amendment raised a point of enormous interest to all voluntary schools and of particular interest to the schools in which he and his friends were interested. They did not pretend to be exactly the spokesmen of English Catholics, but they claimed that they were speaking in a particular manner for the Irish Catholics in this country. If those of Irish extraction were taken from the schools and the congregation they might as well shut up the greater part of the Catholic churches and schools of the country. The figures given the other night by the noble Lord the Member for Chichester as to the position of Catholic schools in this country were dismal, but he did not think they overstated the case. As he listened to those figures and to the debate he could not help regretting that the compromise practically arrived at two years ago by the ingenuity and the ability of his friends and of the Chief Secretary was not carried out. He very much feared they would never get a settlement of the Catholic question so favourable to the schools for which they spoke. He hoped the last word had not been spoken. He asked Nonconformist Members to recollect that they had suffered much in the past for their principles, and he hoped they would not inflict upon Catholics further injustice. By offering them a system of education which they could not accept they were offering them an impossibility and imposing fresh disabilities upon them. He appealed to them. They had an honourable record of which they might be proud, and he asked them to approach the whole of this question in the same spirit in which they had solved the question of University education in Ireland.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he did not think he should be adequately doing his duty to his constituents if he did not pronounce a few words at this stage of the discussion. It seemed to him that this quasi agreement was of a remarkable and precarious character. On the one hand they had concessions made by the friends of the voluntary schools which were of an assured and certain character, and on the other hand they had proposals made by the Government with regard to contracting-out which were of a most uncertain and doubtful character, and which must necessarily create some anxiety in the minds of the supporters of voluntary schools. There was uncertainty as to both the amount and the permanency of the grant to contracted-out schools. It was quite possible that some time in the future a Government might be in power which, viewing contracted-out schools with abhorrence, would discontinue the grant. He would not be doing his duty as Vice-President in association with Lord Halifax of the Yorkshire House of Laymen if he did not say from his certain knowledge that there was a most profound anxiety felt throughout the Northern Province on this subject. He had a great desire for a settlement that would at least last for some years. Unless any arrangement arrived at met with the support of all parties it could not be permanent, and they would find themselves in an even worse position in the course of the next year or two than that they were in now. He felt very keenly that these discussions were injurious to the cause of education which must play a great part in the prosperity or decadence of this nation.

MR. STUART (Sunderland) asked the President of the Board of Education to give the Committee some information as to how far this was and was not an agreed measure. He was extremely desirous of passing this compromise, because he wished to have peace in the educational world for some little time at least. He thought both sides were giving up something and getting something, but what he wanted to know was whether if he endeavoured to amend the Bill he would endanger it by trenching upon the compromise. He wished to know how far this was an agreed Bill. For instance, he would like to know whether there was anything in the recent arrangement made to prevent him differentiating the Catholic position from the Church of England position. In the very clause they were dealing with there was a period allowed for religious education, and he believed that many schools would be troubled very much if the three quarters of an hour allowed was not reduced to half an hour. Would he be at liberty to vote for that diminution without endangering the compromise? There were many things he would like amended which he would not risk moving Amendments upon if it would endanger the Bill. He thought they might be taken a little more into the confidence of the Government. In the year 1884 when there was a dispute between Lords and Commons about the extension of the agricultural franchise and the redistribution of seats there was an agreement arrived at between the members of the Government and the Opposition in the House of Lords, and the very same difficulty arose as the one with which they were now face to face. He wanted to know from the Government how much of this measure was capable of being altered and how much was absolutely agreed upon. Speaking as one who was urgently desirous of accommodating himself to the carrying through of this compromise he thought there was a great deal to be said for the pressure which was being put upon the Government on this point.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) agreed that there was a good deal to be said for the view that the Government should tell the House how much was agreed and how much was not agreed. They also required enlightening as to the precise terms upon which contracting-out was to be arranged. From a business point of view, even if the contracting-out terms were satisfactory this subsection would be open to the same objections. He looked upon contracting-out as a great evil under any circumstances, and under the Bill it would take place in exactly the places where it was least needed—namely, where there were other schools. That seemed eminently undesirable. He wanted to draw attention to the case which seemed to him to have been rather neglected hitherto by those who had been carrying on these negotiations on behalf of the Church, the case of the single school areas where there was going to be no alternative to contracting-out. There this subsection would be the death-warrant of the non-provided schools. The only course open to these schools was to become provided schools and come under the Act. He did not wish to argue the point on its merits, but if it were not part of the bargain nobody on the Opposition side of the House would support this proposal for a moment. It was a quite untenable position to the majority of those interested in denominational teaching in the single-school areas. They would find if this Bill passed into law that instead of having denominational teaching in those schools which were built for that purpose facilities for such teaching would be reduced almost to a nullity. It seemed to be supposed that it would be quite easy in those schools to get that denominational teaching given, but in scattered districts where there were many schools in a single parish and the clergymen had more work than they could get through and where the headmaster might be unwilling to give the teaching, the facility for giving that teaching in those schools would amount to very little indeed, and the whole purpose for which the school was built would have been destroyed. Then there was the question of expense. They were going to ask the denomination to pay for the religious teaching and they were to pay them rent for the schools. What was the difference between the Bill and the present law in this respect? In both cases the school was owned by the denomination or the trust and utilised by the local education authority. At the present time rent was not paid, but in future rent would be paid, but they would not have the same right of giving denominational teaching. Under these new proposals the denominational teaching would be less, and there would be a considerable balance to the owners or trustees of those schools after they had paid the local education authority for that particular portion of the teachers' salary devoted to denominational instruction. Where was that to come from? He should like to ask the President of the Board of Education if there were any actuarial statistics to show the additional cost which would fall upon the rates. People in the rural districts would see that while their children were not receiving the same religious instruction as before their rates would be heavily increased. This would not be acceptable in those districts, and especially in the single-school districts. They could not expect the owners of those schools to be willing to give them up to the local authority without rent unless similar facilities for religious instruction were given as hitherto. On these grounds he would vote for the Amendment.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he was sure the bulk of hon. Members would feel regret at the tone which this discussion had taken. He had endeavoured to follow the debate in order to obtain some idea of the principle upon which this proposal was based. The noble Lord asked whether the Archbishop of Canterbury assented to this subsection, and his right hon. friend replied that he had assented to it, although reluctantly.

LORD R. CECIL: I am afraid that I failed to make myself clear to the hon. Gentleman. The whole point of my speech was that we have no ground for thinking that the Archbishop of Canterbury assented to this subsection except upon certain terms, and that we are not sure, in fact we have every reason to believe that he was not satisfied with the terms proposed.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE: The noble Lord distinctly said that the Archbishop of Canterbury had reluctantly assented.

LORD R. CECIL: Conditionally.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE: On the conditions set forth here. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] Certainly, so far as he was aware that assent to the first subsection depended upon what, he believed, was the substance of the whole debate, namely, the amount of grant to be allowed to the contracted-out schools. The answer given by the President of the Board of Education was all the answer he could give on the matter. The right hon. Gentleman read the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Archbishop of Canterbury which showed plainly that the actual financial conditions had not been finally settled. He gathered from the correspondence that this was still an open question, and he thought that should have satisfied the House that, whilst that was a debatable point, his right hon. friend could give no further information at this stage. But did not that bring the discussion down to a certain number of shillings that would settle or unsettle the whole question? He understood the desire of the Leader of the Opposition and others who had spoken was to know exactly on what basis the contracting-out grant was to be fixed. Surely, if there was nothing in this contracting-out clause beyond the question of a few shillings, that should not be used as a means of wrecking this arrangement, which seemed to be the object of some hon. Members who had addressed the House. The noble Lord had said that information had been given that the Nonconformists whom he himself represented were determined to make no further concessions. He should like to point out to the noble Lord that they had no knowledge whatever, any more than the House generally, of the terms of contracting-out. He was quite sure unless it could be shown that these terms were altogether inadequate that was a point on which they would be sorry to wreck the Bill. They must, however, put this limitation upon that statement—they did feel that the denominations who claimed the liberty which contracting-out would give them should be prepared to give something, as they had professed themselves willing to do, for that liberty. With that limitation he was quite sure that hon. Members on that side of the House would, so far as the financial question was concerned, meet it with an open mind and a desire to get at what was fair and reasonable as between all the parties. So much had been introduced into this discussion that if he were to attempt to follow the arguments of the speakers opposite he was afraid that he should embark on a Second Reading debate, rather than confine himself to the discussion of Clause 1. If the clause was being discussed, as he thought it ought to be discussed, on the merits of contracting-out apart from the question of finance, then he should take it that contracting-out was a part of the agreement which could not be broken without the whole thing being irretrievably lost. If, on the other hand, it was merely a question of doing justice to the denominations who desired in part or in whole to contract out, then he did not think they ought to come to a division on that question which was admitted to be unsettled. He felt, as one who voted for the Second Reading of this measure, that it was not open to him to move any Amendment affecting vital principles on the one side or the other, but at the same time he felt at liberty to put down Amendments affecting the administration or the machinery of the Bill, with due regard to questions of principle. If his right hon. friend pointed out that any of the Amendments he put down was going contrary to what was regarded as a principle involved, he should feel in honour bound to withdraw the Amendment. That was the spirit in which he thought the Bill should be approached by those who voted for the Second Reading. Those who did not vote for the Second Reading of the Bill were free to take what course they pleased. The hon. Member for Burnley was antagonistic to the Bill, not particularly because of the compromise—he would have been equally antagonistic to the Bill which was withdrawn—but because he was a strong and logical supporter of the purely secular position. He could understand hon. Members who supported the secular position; he thought they were perfectly justified in taking up that position; but if those who supported the Second Reading in the hope that they might be able to come to a reasonable settlement attempted to bring in Amendments which distinctly conflicted with the main principles of the Bill they showed either that their vote in the first instance was given under a misapprehension, or that they had seen reason to alter their minds in that respect. He assured hon. Members opposite that they were not alone in the conviction that a clause like this was going to work mischief in some respects. They were told from that side of the House the same thing, but if contracting-out was an essential part of the arrangement—and he and his friends on that side conceived that it was, though from the educational point of view he should desire to see some other arrangement made—he felt that it was not open in the circumstances to do otherwise than had been done. He had expressed more than once his sympathy for the Catholic position. He hoped his Catholic friends would remember that they made claims in regard to education in this country which they did not make in other countries, or, if they made them, they did not obtain. When the hon. Member and his friends pleaded for the Catholic consciences to be respected, they must make a similar appeal to Catholics. When Catholics attempted to impose conditions, and said that they must have a Catholic atmosphere in their schools, he thought they were putting a tax upon them which it was impossible to meet, however willing.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester): The Catholics of this country found the land on which their schools are built, and they paid for the buildings.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE said he could not answer the noble Lord on that question without being led far from the Amendment and he did not wish to be called to order by the Chairman. He would simply say that Catholics in demanding conditions which they did not obtain from other English-speaking races were putting them to a test to which they could not fairly respond. He believed the Government were willing to deal with the Catholic schools as liberally as the circumstances would allow. He trusted his hon. friends would not take up the position of endeavouring to wreck the Bill on the contracting-out clause. If they did so, they were bound to offer some other solution than that which was before the Committee at the present moment. He thought it was most unfortunate that on this clause, the main principle of which had been sanctioned on the Second Reading, they had had a discussion which did not bode well for the future progress of the Bill through the House. He believed there was a large and increasing number of people in the country who saw in this Bill a suggested mode of settlement which was on the whole in the complicated character of our education system the fairest which could be obtained. He hoped that the House would address itself to the Bill not as a positively agreed measure, but as a largely agreed measure. He believed all outstanding matters were capable of adjustment if the House would continue to pursue the course in regard to the Bill which they pursued on the Second Reading.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said he should like to state the difficulties which presented themselves to the minds of himself and his hon. friends when considering how they were to vote on this subsection. The subsection embodied one side of a bargain. The compromise as it had been called, or the agreed Bill, depended on the one side on the surrender of the voluntary schools, and on the other side upon certain other conditions as to right of entry, transfer, and contracting-out. What they were asked to do in dealing with this subsection was to embody in the Bill the surrender of the voluntary schools. At this moment the Committee knew nothing of two very important matters about which they ought to be informed if this Bill was to be considered as a compromise. The terms of transfer were still matter of negotiation outside the House. Contracting-out also was still matter of negotiation. That they should be informed about contracting-out was the more important because general dissatisfaction had been expressed on both sides of the House with the practice of contracting-out. It was a dissatisfaction which he himself felt profoundly. Under the ruling of the Chairman there would be no opportunity for discussing the Amendment which the hon. Member for East Mayo had put down. That Amendment would have led to the consideration of an alternative for contracting-out—an alternative which he should have liked to see embodied in the Bill. The Committee would be precluded as soon as this subsection was passed from considering the new clause of which the hon. Member for East Mayo had given notice, and under these circumstances it was all the more important that they should know what were the conditions of contracting-out. Were they such as would impoverish the schools now, and still more hereafter, or were they conditions which would alter and improve the figures now in the Bill? This measure had been spoken of as an agreed Bill or compromise. They were asked to vote one portion of that compromise when they not only did not know what were the terms of the other portion but when the contracting parties outside did not know themselves. He called attention to the two leading points referred to by the Archbishop, viz., the terms offered to schools which elected to contract-out and the conditions of the transfer. On these points the Archbishop stated that he was thoroughly dissatisfied with what had been stated in the House by the Minister for Education. Now, what they wanted to know was whether the parties were agreed, or whether there was any reasonable probability that they would be agreed. Those were two points on which they ought to be satisfied before they were asked to vote for the subsection.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said he regretted that he was not able to be present at an earlier part of the sitting. The hon. Gentleman had made a very fair appeal to him, and he would do his best to respond. He never represented, nor did the President of the Board of Education, that this was a concluded agreement, signed, sealed, and delivered; an agreement which it was only for the House to register. He expressly guarded himself in the speech for the Second Reading from taking any such view of the matter. What he said was that the parties concerned had, in the opinion of the Government, arrived within measurable distance of a settlement. They believed that on the main points of principle both sides were prepared to give way, and that under those conditions the Government had made themselves responsible for making proposals which they hoped would form a basis of discussion, and, after modification, if modification were necessary, would be acceptable to both. It was on that understanding that the House read the Bill a second time. They were now dealing with a clause which, if carried into law, would give the local authorities in the future an absolute control over all schools to the expenses of which the rates had contributed. That was, perhaps, the main part of the sacrifice or concession which the Church of England made to the Nonconformists in consideration of the later clauses of the Bill, which represented the concession or sacrifice which the Nonconformists made to the Church. The hon. Gentleman was quite entitled to say: "If we agree to pass this clause, are you satisfied, or can you give us reasonable ground for believing, that the other part of the consideration is going to be satisfied also?" What was the essence of the consideration moving from the Nonconformist side? It was first of all, the right of entry conceded by Clause 2, and as to which he repeated that if there was any reasonable doubt as to whether it was adequately safeguarded by the drafting of the clause in its present form, the Government were most anxious that whatever might be obscure should be made clear, and that whatever was insufficient should be made sufficient; and the second head or branch of the consideration moving from that side was undoubtedly the system of contracting-out. There again certain clauses of the Bill provided that the contracting-out schools should receive no support from the rates, but a large part of their expenditure from the Exchequer. They regarded it as essential to this proposed compromise that there should be, in consideration of the clause now under discussion, an effective right of entry into provided schools, guaranteed to the denomination on the demand of an adequate number of parents, and that there should be a system of contracting-out, in the language agreed to between the Archbishop and himself, which should give to the contracting-out schools a reasonable prospect of existence, while providing, at the same time, that some substantial part of the bill should be borne by the denomination. That was the compact, so far as there was one, and he had every reason at that moment to hope that that part of the consideration would be fulfilled to the satisfaction of both parties. He could not say that there was at the moment a concluded agreement in regard to the precise scale fixed in the schedules either for the rent to be paid for transferred schools or the scale of grants to be paid in respect of contracting-out schools. That was a matter still under discussion. The proposals made by the

Government he believed to be adequate for the purpose and that they would fulfil what was agreed with the Archbishop. In regard to the contracting-out schools, in effect they provided that 85 per cent. of the expenses should be paid out of the Exchequer, leaving only 15 per cent. to be paid by the denomination. He was not saying whether that was right or wrong, but it was a very much larger sum paid out of public funds than the percentage prior to the Act of 1902, which, if his memory served him correctly, was not more than 75 per cent. That was their proposition, and they were still awaiting any criticism in regard to these figures which had been invited, but had not yet come, and to which, when it did come, they would certainly give most respectful and sympathetic consideration. Beyond that he could not go. He agreed that the clause to which they were asking the House to assent necessitated a considerable sacrifice of the position hitherto tenaciously held by the Church, but it was in consideration of the assurance that it was their intention to proceed with Clauses 2 and 3, which involved a surrender in principle of positions as tenaciously held by the Nonconformists. He could not at that moment say that he had an absolutely concluded agreement, but he had the best reason to hope that on this point also an agreement would be made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that unfortunately the right hon. Gentleman was not present at the beginning of the discussion. Of course, he knew that the right hon. Gentleman would have been present if he could have been. He was well aware of how heavy the burdens were which were laid upon the right hon. Gentleman and the necessity of his absenting himself from some portions of their discussions. He was convinced that the right hon. Gentleman had not only told them the truth—that he need hardly say—but that he had told them the whole of the truth, which was a much more important thing.

MR. ASQUITH: And nothing but the truth.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: But is the truth really satisfactory? Could they say that they were voting in the full knowledge of all the elements which should influence their judgment? The Prime Minister must feel that if he had only entered upon the negotiations at an earlier period, or had deferred discussion in Committee until negotiations had reached a more mature stage, the great difficulty in which they now found themselves would have been avoided. The House was really divided into two sections—the optimists and the pessimists. The optimists thought the Bill would give them a settlement. The pessimists, of whom he was one, doubted it. But was it an unreasonable protest against the course of the Government in asking them to deal with a section of the whole that was precise and clear, while leaving in obscurity later portions, it being admitted by the Prime Minister that he had not yet come to an agreement with the Archbishop of Canterbury? He imagined that the prospect of an agreement with the Roman Catholics, to whom the Prime Minister did not refer, was even more dim. The right hon. Gentleman told them he had every hope that he would be able to offer such terms in regard to the transferred and the contracting-out schools as would give reasonable satisfaction, but he had given no ground for that hope, and the only public statement they had had from the Archbishop was profoundly hostile to what the right hon. Gentleman most unhappily called a detail. The Archbishop had expressed himself in, as he thought, a most gloomy spirit upon the proposals the Government still thought fair, and there was not a single representative of the Roman Catholics who had not expressed, in the strongest permissible language, his belief that this could be no settlement. Under these circumstances he quite admitted he could ask for no further revelations from the Government, because he believed they had no further revelations to give, but he was justified in expressing his deep regret that the right hon. Gentleman asked them to come to a conclusion on this question, before all those interested in this great and bitter controversy had come to some agreement with His Majesty's Government. They had nothing to found their conduct upon except the vague—he was afraid very vague—hopes of a very optimistic administration. That appeared to him a very unsatisfactory foundation on which to base further discussion on the Committee stage of the Bill.

MR. ASQUITH said he did not think it was necessary to prolong this discussion. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of those who approached this Bill in an optimistic and in a pessimistic spirit, but he would rather be disposed to describe the two attitudes of mind as being on the one hand those who desired to obtain a settlement and on the other those who did not. He believed the great majority of Members of the House desired a settlement and it was to them he would make his appeal. Here they had the first subsection of the clause which involved a surrender and a large surrender by one of the parties. They come on presently to the second and third subsections of the clause which involved another surrender. If they found when they reached later stages that an agreement had not been arrived at and there were no elements of a satisfactory settlement, neither those who agreed with a settlement nor those who were opposed to it, would feel that there was much use in prosecuting their labours; but surely they might wait until they had reached that stage before they abandoned all hope of the great measure which was now before the House and the country. It was in that spirit he would ask the Committee to continue its discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not wish to continue the discussion but he was bound to say that when the right hon. Gentleman chose to describe himself and a large number of Members of the House who voted against the Second Reading of the Bill as persons who did not desire a settlement he used language which was unnecessarily provocative and offensive and which no Minister would dare use if they were not working under the gag.

MR. HUNT was understood to say that he wished to know whether this was supposed to be an agreed Bill. The Minister for Education said that the contracting-out schools ought to have a reasonable chance, but what did he mean? Was it an even chance or a ten to one chance; so far as he could make out the odds were longer. The Catholics were willing to accept most reasonable terms, but it appeared that the Nonconformists wanted their own religion to be taught without paying for it; they wanted the other denominations to pay for it and receive nothing in return.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 211; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 420).

AYES.

Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Go.)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton

Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Samuel,Rt.Hn.H.L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn Sir Alex.F
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Alexander
Delany, William
Dillon, John
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hill, Sir Clement
Hogan, Michael
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)

MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehy, David
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Hunt and Viscount Helmsley

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston), in moving to insert the word "fully" said the point of his Amendment was that contracting-out schools had a right to some assistance from the rates. They ought to make some contribution from their own pockets in order to preserve their liberty, but they ought to get some assistance from the rates, not as a charity but a right. Supposing it were possible to allocate the rates those who desired to have a particular type of school would allocate the rate they paid to that particular type and those who wanted another type of school would allocate the rate they paid to that, and nobody could say that that would be unfair. But as that was impossible the only way in which justice could be dealt out would be to give those who desired a particular type of school a share of that money which they contributed to other schools in the shape of rates. After the discussion that had taken place however he would not press his Amendment. He begged formally to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5 after the word 'be' to insert the word 'fully.'"

Question, "That the word 'fully' be there inserted,"—put, and negatived.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) in proposing to insert the words "except as hereinafter provided," said that if these words were not inserted here, it would be impossible on the subsequent stage to raise the question of the different classes of schools which should be maintine by the local education authority. The Secretary to the Admiralty had taunted the Catholic representatives with the fact that in 1906 they supported the principle of contracting out, and the hon. Member for Preston had said the same thing. That was a most unfair and misleading way of stating what occurred in that year. When Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906 was introduced it was entirely unsatisfactory to them in its form, and was so hemmed round with conditions that the Catholic schools could not avail themselves of its provisions. While that clause was in its original shape the hon. Member for Preston got up and moved that the schools excluded from that clause should be permitted to contract out. That they supported, because it provided as it were a back door by means of which Catholic schools might be able to get some means of living on. It was wholly misrepresenting what occurred to say that the Catholic representatives in the House supported the principle of contracting out. Throughout all the discussions of the 1906 Bill they declared that the true place for their schools was within the national system of education, and that they saw the greatest possible evils would arise if they were driven out of it. The present Chief Secretary for Ireland when he assented to the principle of contracting out, defended it on the ground that it was an exception grafted on to an exception, and that it would apply only to a minority of individual schools. But how different was that from saying that all the Catholic schools of the country must accept the principle of contracting out or perish. The hon. Member for Preston said he understood that they were willing to pay for the privilege of liberty in order to get rid of public control, and that the only way of getting rid of public control was by contracting out. The position which existed was that the Catholics of this country were demanding public control, and the Government was going to refuse it. They wished the fullest public control consistent with the protection of the conscientious convictions of their people, and the Government said: "No, you must contract out and we will give you this grant."

*MR. HAROLD COX asked whether the hon. Member was in favour of the local authority appointing the teachers in the Catholic schools.

MR. DILLON said that was so, and it was in order to make way for a clause which he had on the Paper that he was proposing this Amendment. The Catholics were asking to be included in the national system, asking for public control, and said that it was possible to conciliate the conscientious convictions of the people they represented with public control and the inclusion of the Anglican and Catholic schools in the national system. He denied that when the Government offered contracting out they were offering a privilege. They had never asked for the right to contract out, and they were, therefore, entitled to say it was no privilege. The President of the Board of Education in introducing this Bill had characterised contracting out as most objectionable from an educational point of view, but at the same time had asserted that it was impossible to come to a settlement without contracting-out. He traversed that assertion and denied it. It was quite possible, and if the Government accepted his clause, it could be done now. The right hon. Gentleman could arrive at an agreement with the Catholic school managers without any recourse to contracting-out, which he quite agreed was extremely objectionable from an educational point of view. He denied that contracting-out was a privilege, especially with the conditions that had to be observed, which were that there must be none in single school districts; there must be thirty children in attendance; and the schools must attain equal efficiency with the council schools, in staff, prices, and secular instruction. The last condition under present circumstances was impossible, and it was a most evil and monstrous thing to present as a settlement a contracting-out scheme saddled with that condition. It was impossible now, and would become more and more impossible as education progressed. By setting up this system they admitted that it was a question of conscience with the Catholics of this country. The hon. Member for North-West Norfolk in his very sympathetic speech had said that when Catholics asked that Catholic schools and Catholic teachers should be paid for at the public expense they were asking for what could not be granted. The Government were offering to Catholic schools under this contracting-out clause £6,000 a year, which the Archbishop of Westminster was to distribute among them, with the smallest possible amount of public control. They could have in the Catholic schools freedom from public control, and all these things which they did not ask, but they must put their hands into their pockets, and pay the difference, pay a fine for their consciences. That nobody could deny who looked at the Bill with a fair mind. With regard to the great question of denominational education being paid for out of the rates they had all heard over and over again the famous alliteration "Rome on the rates." It was a phrase coined by Dr. Clifford, for whom he had a great respect, though he had always fought against him. When Dr. Clifford spoke of "Rome on the rates" he only used that phrase for the sake of its alliteration. What he really meant was "Anglicanism on the rates." He was sure the Rev. John Clifford did not care so much about Rome being on the rates; it was the Anglican Church to which he objected being put on the rates. What difference did it make whether Rome was on the rates or on the taxes? All they asked was that the children in the Catholic schools should not be condemned to an inferior system of education, because of conscientious objections. The Government were proposing under this Bill to pay the rent of the Anglican schools and they paid that rent although they gave them facilities for putting their children into these public schools and teaching Anglican doctrines there, and they must also remember that under this system of Cowper-Temple teaching they had a form of religious teaching which to three-fourths of the laymen of the Church of England was satisfactory. Why could not the Government relieve the consciences of men like the Rev. Dr. Clifford, by setting off against the cost of teaching Catholic doctrine and catechism, the rent of the Catholic schools? It would have more than paid and if by taking over the schools they allowed a small rent they would set that off against the cost of teaching Catholic doctrine and by that means they would lift Rome, not only off the rates, but off the taxes also, and they would convince people that they were not paying the expenses of teaching Catholic doctrine. What was it he proposed as an alternative? He was opposed on every ground to contracting-out. He was glad to recognise that the Prime Minister was not going to adhere very strictly to the scale of the schedules, but even so, he still feared there would be a heavy and serious burden thrown upon the Catholic people, and no matter what improvement was made in the amount of the grant the opinion would prevail that the education was to be on a lower scale. Now he directed attention to his alternative proposal. His alternative was to revive the clause of the Bill of 1906, which after prolonged discussion was agreed to by the representatives of the Catholic schools and by the Liberal Government as speaking for the Nonconformists. It was quite true that many of the Nonconformists were not enamoured of the clause. They were discontented, but a good deal had happened since then, and the fact had to be remembered that the Government and the Catholic schools accepted that scheme by which the Catholic schools could come in, although he knew many Nonconformists objected to it he would ask was there any Nonconformists to-day who would get up and say that they preferred the concession they were making under this Bill to that which was made by the Bill of 1906? In the interests of education and of the Catholic schools he appealed to the Nonconformists upon the other side of the House to say whether they could not agree to give back that clause of the Bill of 1906, and at least to allow the Catholic schools to make the experiment of coming into the national system. The terrible danger that oppressed him in connection with this matter arose when he looked to the future which many of the leaders even of their own Church had failed to do. He looked with the utmost dread on any measure that would stereotype the Catholic schools as an excrescence upon the national system. One reason was this. This Bill whether it passed or not had an enormous weight of public opinion behind it; the vote on the Second Reading proved that. Had it not been for the solid vote of the Irish Party the division would have been ridiculous. This was, in point of fact, a Protestant settlement. He did not say that it included all the Protestants, but it certainly had behind it the overwhelming mass of the Protestants of this country, and, with the great Protestant forces supporting it, the Bill was moving inevitably towards a Protestant settlement. The Bill might be wrecked, but if it were, another Bill would be introduced on the same lines, with, it might be, some modifications. The great questions on which the Bill would be fought in the course of these discussions were not questions which interested Catholics in the slightest degree. The right of entry and questions of that kind, of the utmost importance where Protestant schools were being transferred, did not interest Catholics in the smallest particular. As was pointed out the other day by the hon. Member for Cambridge University and also by the hon. Member for Oxford University, in many cases the Anglican schools were being rapidly transferred to the public authorities, and the number of children in the public schools was increasing day by day. That was not the case with Catholic schools, which remained in the same position. Therefore he was afraid, looking into the future, that Catholic schools would be left outside of the national settlement, and that whatever Anglican schools might contract-out, they would gradually drift, under Protestant influence, into the national system. Catholic schools would remain struggling outside until they were left isolated and alone. Too poor to protect themselves and secure fair play, they would eventually find themselves completely outside the general Protestant settlement. Catholics in this country were only 2,000,000 as against 40,000,000, and he was afraid, looking into the future, that they would hear it said that the public rates and taxes ought not to be burdened by the support of Catholic schools. The hon. Member for North-West Norfolk had used these warning words, namely, that in making these demands Catholics were asking for privileges which were not given to Roman Catholics in any other English-speaking country of the world. That was perfectly true. Although Catholics were a third of the population, and among the wealthiest of the whole of the Australians, they did not get 1s. for any of their schools, nor even in the United States did Catholic schools receive anything from public funds. But he might inform the hon. Member for North-West Norfolk that he had talked with some of the leaders of public opinion in Australia who had stated that there was an undercurrent of doubt as to whether they had acted wisely in this respect towards Catholic schools. He thought there was an increasing feeling in that direction. He repeated that he feared, looking into the future, that Catholics would be left outside of the Protestant settlement, and they would become so isolated that someone would get up in that Assembly and say: "Why should they remain on the taxes?" Therefore, he made a strong appeal to all fair-minded men in the House, who desired to see fair play and justice done to all fellow-citizens, and who repudiated, as he was sure Nonconformists sitting beside him would repudiate with warmth, any notion that they would be party to inflicting injuries or civic disabilities on Catholics in this country. For conscience sake, and though they differed from Catholics widely, he appealed to the Nonconformists to open the door so that the Catholic schools for which he spoke might come into the national settlement, and not be caused to contract-out, which had been condemned educationally by everyone, and by the very Minister who had introduced this Bill. He had received that morning, like other Members he dared say, a document which added still further to his fears. It was an important document from the Manchester Diocesan Council which passed a series of resolutions the other day. The Bishop of Manchester, who had taken a prominent part in discussing the Bill, was present. The last of the resolutions was to the effect that the proposal as to contracting-out was an express contradiction of the principle of public or local control; that the children attending such schools would be unjustly deprived of the benefit of the rates paid by their parents; and finally—

> "That the provision was unjust in itself and framed with a view of conciliating one section of the community, and ought to be taken out of the Bill."

He was grateful to the Leader of the Opposition and to the other hon. Members above the gangway who had spoken on their behalf, but he did not think as Catholics they would be wise in trusting their future to an alliance with them, because it could not in the nature of things remain. Hon. Members who were the representatives of the Protestants in this country would either now or in the near future come to an arrangement, because they had principles in common. Roman Catholic Members could not come to an arrangement that would suit Protestants. They had principles which they could not surrender, principles which had nothing to do with Cowper-Temple teaching or the right of entry, and they would be allowing themselves to be forced into a dangerous and indefensible position if they allowed their schools to be permanently shut out of a national system in this country and penned into small preserves of their own. He appealed to the Nonconformist leaders to reconsider their decision, and to ask themselves whether they would not be acting more in consonance with their own principles of justice, fair play, and generosity, if they revived Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906 and allowed the Catholics to come into the national system.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'authority' to insert the words 'except as hereinafter provided.'"—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. RUNCIMAN said it was difficult for the Government to withstand the appeal made by the hon. Gentleman, and on more than one ground. They knew perfectly well that the nonconformists of this country had long had sympathy with the Roman Catholics in their struggles, first of all to get rid of their disabilities, and secondly, to secure for themselves a place in the educational system of the country, and they had all admired the efforts made by the Roman Catholics to keep alive their own schools, conducted entirely on their own principles, not only in this country but elsewhere. He was sure the hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House would acquit him and his colleagues of any trace of bigotry which had made the existence of Roman Catholics in some parts of England, Wales and Scotland, almost intolerable. But when he asked the Government to revive Clause 4 of the 1906 Bill in its final form, he was sorry to say he could not satisfy him. When the old Clause 4 in its final form left the House, it went up to the House of Lords, and every Catholic Peer voted against it. If his recollection was correct he believed the hon. Gentleman himself warned the Catholic Peers that by refusing to accept Clause 4 in its final form they were really striking a serious blow at the Roman Catholic position in this country.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I think the right hon. Gentleman is mistaken. Clause 4 in its final form was never voted upon—that is to say, the words in the concluding paragraph as it stands on the Paper—

> "Provided that the local education authority shall appoint persons acceptable to the Parents Committee to be teachers of the school."

That was certainly not in the clause when it was voted against in the House.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said the hon. Gentleman was correct. The clause had four forms, and it was voted against by the House of Lords in its penultimate form. It was unacceptable to the hon. Gentleman and his friends, and when it was objected to by the Catholic Peers, the hon. Member for Mayo warned the Catholic Peers that by refusing this compromise they were striking a blow at the Roman Catholic position in this country. As far as he remembered, the hon. Gentleman himself had no sympathy with their extreme action. He asked the House to look at the position he (Mr. Runciman) found himself in when dealing with Clause 4. He could not carry Nonconformist opinion with him in the country on Clause 4. It was quite impossible for him to do so, and it must be perfectly clear that he could go no distance whatever in the negotiations if he had not had behind him practically the solid Nonconformist opinion of the country. Indeed there would be no ending to this long controversy if Nonconformist opinion as a whole was not in favour of the terms arrived at. If Clause 4 had been one of these terms he could not have carried the Nonconformists with him. That must be his reason for saying that at present they could not accept Clause 4. The hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House said the Catholic position was no different now from what it was two or three years ago. If he might accept the opinion of the head of the Roman Catholic Church he might take it that the Catholic Church did not wish to have public control over the management of their schools. He would like to read to the House a considered statement of Archbishop Bourne made just previous to the last general election wherein he said—

> "To take the management of schools intended for Catholic children out of the hands of those who represent the religious convictions of their parents and to place it in the hands of public ratepayers who cannot represent those convictions is a violation of parental rights to be resisted as an unwarrantable attack upon religious liberty."

He gathered from that statement that Archbishop Bourne and the Roman Catholics in this country could not accept full public control. The Government had laid it down as a principle from which they could not depart, that if rate aid was to be given the schools must submit to full public control and their management must be under the control of those who subscribed for the upkeep of those schools, and finally that teacherships should be thrown open to men of all denominations so long as the whole of their salaries were paid for out of public funds. The Catholics wished to have preserved 5,000 teacherships to members of the Roman Catholic Church. That was a very large piece of private patronage. He did not object to hon. Gentlemen opposite wishing to retain it, but so long as they retained it they could not have the same terms as were given to those trustees who were prepared to allow their teacherships to be filled by men of all denominations. Rate aid and full control were necessary corollaries, and he could see no way of their departing from that principle. The hon. Gentleman had stated that some provisions in the Bill might be of advantage to Anglicans as well as Roman Catholics. They had endeavoured as far as they possibly could to treat Anglicans and Roman Catholics alike, and where they had provided for the payment of rent and the transfer of schools that rent was payable equally in the case of Roman Catholics and Anglicans. He quite recognised the position taken up by the Catholics in regard to their schools. They said they could not, and never had, transferred any one of their schools. He admired their adhesion to that principle, but if they refused to come into the national system, under the conditions in which a national system must be controlled, he deeply regretted their decision, but they could not possibly be treated in the same way as those who came under entire public control, and which were manned by teachers of all denominations. Teacherships could not be treated as a preserve for any one church. When he said it was impossible to arrive at an agreement with Roman Catholics except by contracting-out, he said it because they could not have an agreement to which the Nonconformists would be parties. He believed that the only way in which they could provide for the continued existence of Roman Catholic schools in this country in a position of efficiency was to give them a sufficient contracting-out grant. Everything turned on the amount. There had been really most grotesque exaggerations of the amount which would have to be found by Roman Catholics under the Government's contracting-out scheme. It had been said that they provided for giving about 50s. per child contracting-out grant to the Roman Catholic schools, and this was compared with the cost of education in London, which was declared to be £5 18s. per child. This £5 18s. included not only maintenance but loan and sinking fund charges. The comparison was, consequently, absurd. He had no wish to oppress Roman Catholics in matters of money. The Government had done their best to find out what was their view. Only that morning at the Board of Education they were presented with figures as to the cost of Roman Catholic schools, which did not give, he thought, a correct account of the total cost of the upkeep of those schools. The Catholics had been good enough to send up their figures to the Department, and if they could prove their case as it had been stated in the public prints, that they would have to find £300,000 a year to keep their schools in existence, the Government would be prepared to reconsider the financial provisions. But he was certain that that figure was vastly exaggerated and no such enormous sum was likely to fall on the Roman Catholics if the 50s. grant went through. When he compared it with the amount of the grant in Scotland he was encouraged to think that the figures they had suggested were just and fair. In Scotland the contracted-out schools at the present moment got between 38s. and 40s. The hon. Members from Ireland told them they would be satisfied with a 10s. rise on that. He could not help thinking of the comparative cost of education in England and in Scotland. Scotland spent generously on education, and if 40s. was enough in Scotland he could only hope and believe 50s. was enough in England, and he hoped they would be satisfied with the sum with which they were satisfied in Scotland. He wished they would come frankly into the national system. He was perfectly certain there was not a single authority in the United Kingdom which would not give the fullest facilities for the teaching of Catholic children. He was sure the authorities would go a very long way towards meeting the peculiarities of the Roman Catholic case—further than they were at present prepared to admit. But as they insisted on standing out and retaining private patronage, he regretted that he could not see any arrangement which would allow their incomes to be increased out of the rates levied by the local authorities.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he deeply deplored the answer which had just been given by the President of the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman had altogether misunderstood the point of the Amendment, for he had reduced it simply to a question of finance. It was not a question of finance, but one of principle, of religious equality, and educational efficiency. The Government claimed that they were willing to meet the Irish Catholics in regard to the grants as far as they possibly could, but his argument on this point was that they could not make a school with a grant minus the rates as efficient as a school with a grant plus the rates. The right hon. Gentleman's statement that the Catholic Peers voted against Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906 was unfounded, because they did not vote against the final form of that clause. It was true they voted against the penultimate form but not against the final form. But supposing they did. Did the right hon. Gentleman lay down that the Catholic Peers of the Conservative Party were entitled to speak for the Nationalist Party in this House with regard to Catholic education? He had not the smallest doubt that some of those Peers would vote against the Second Reading of the Irish Land Bill this session if it reached the House of Lords. In that case what would any hon. Member think of the Chief Secretary for Ireland if he withdrew the Irish Land Bill because the Catholic Peers opposed it? The hon. Member for East Mayo over and over again had condemned the attitude of the Catholic Peers on this question. The President of the Board of Education said he could not get the Nonconformist yarty to support him in bringing forward again Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906, but was that a worthy position for the Minister for Education to take up? He would remind the House that the Clause 4 referred to in its ultimate form was sanctioned by the Prime Minister of that day, by the Minister for Education of that day, by the present Prime Minister, and by the Government as a whole of 1906. What right, therefore, had the present Government to recede from the position taken up in 1906 if it was a just position? If the position was just in 1906, why was it unjust to-day? This was a most extraordinary doctrine of political expediency, and he never expected such a doctrine to emanate from the ingenious mind of the Minister for Education. It was not only extraordinary but it was a political cynicism that rights granted in 1906 should be withheld in 1908 simply because a certain extreme section of the followers of the Government objected. He wished to deal in a word or two with that familiar cry of "Rome on the rates." He was sorry that he was not in a position to argue this point as if he were dealing not with Catholic but with Jewish schools, because the position was practically the same. The Jews were separated from every Christian community by an impassable gulf of dogma, but they were no more separated from the Protestants of this country than the Catholics were. In many cases the Jews had built and supported their own schools, and in their fidelity to their schools under persecution there was a great analogy between them and the Catholics. As their sufferings and convictions were similar, he contended that they ought to receive the same treatment. He did not wish to be offensive, but what would be said of him if he started the cry of "Jerusalem on the rates"? He would at once be told that he was using the language of bigotry, but he would be quite as much justified in using that phrase as others were in using the cry of "Rome on the rates." One of the most high-minded men in this country, the Chief Rabbi, said the other day he was afraid that the private and voluntary Jewish schools would disappear under this Bill, and would be merged into the national system. The Minister for Education had been very eloquent in regard to the unacceptability of the claim to have Catholic teaching in Catholic schools. If there was to be Catholic teaching by the head teacher, would any man in his senses propose that it should be given by anybody but a Catholic; would he suggest that a Baptist or a Congregationalist or Dr. Clifford should go to a Catholic school and teach or try to teach the Catholic children doctrines in which they profoundly disbelieved, thus placing themselves in the dilemma of teaching doctrines which they did not believe and making hypocrites of themselves, or else teaching doctrines in which they did believe but which were antagonistic to the religion of the parents of the children? In North-East Manchester and the East End of London, where there were a large number of Jewish and Catholic schools, they would be called public schools, and they would be declared to be entirely under public control. They would be declared to be entirely free from any tests as applied to the teachers, and they would be precluded from giving anything but simple Bible-teaching. Let him pass from these childish formulas to the realities. In some of the schools in the East End of London nearly every child would be a Jew and nearly every teacher, and certainly the head teacher, would be a Jew, and there would be simple Bible-teaching in that school. It would, however, be limited to the Old Testament; and yet they were told that although they should admit to the national system a Jewish school with Jewish religious teaching given by Jewish teachers, they should exclude a Catholic school with Catholic teaching and Catholic teachers. Without expressing sympathy with the Jewish position, he had some right to complain that their fellow-Christians in this country would not extend the same charity and consideration to those who were separated from them by a similar impassable dogma to that which separated them from the Jews. The party of popular control and anti-clericalism were now opposing an Amendment which proposed popular control and minimised clerical control. That was an extraordinary antithesis and reversal of positions. What would happen? He did not wish to be misunderstood on this point. He had in his constituency in Liverpool a number of Catholic priests who, every Sunday, wet or dry, for the last ten or fifteen years had gone out and made a collection for the building and maintenance of their schools. A deputation came to him from Liverpool last Friday on this subject. He might mention incidentally that the President of the Board of Education was mistaken as to the views of Catholic authorities on contracting-out. In Liverpool, to a man, the Catholic bishop, priests and laymen were not only in hostility to contracting-out but they were in a state of feverish and almost dangerous excitement at the prospect, and the only reason why he did not advocate to them passive resistance to rates paid by Catholics was the likelihood of passive resistance taking another form. It was his duty, as one of the representatives of that great community in Liverpool, to appease rather than to inflame popular hostility to contracting-out. What would happen under this Bill? The Prime Minister had given it as a strong reason why they should support this Bill that at the present time they were getting 85 per cent. of their expenses. But was that a fair comparison? A fair standard to take was not their position as it existed before but after the passing of the Act of 1902. The children attending Catholic schools were as entitled to every penny of the rates and taxes as the children of other religions attending other schools. The right hon. Gentleman had talked about Catholics being better by 10 per cent. What he should have said was that they were 15 per cent. worse under this Bill than under the Act of 1902. Therefore that entitled him to say that so far as the educational efficiency of their school was concerned this was not progress but retrogression. There had been a great deal said about passive resistance on the other side of the House. This Bill had been brought forward largely for the purpose of meeting the case of the passive resister. He had some sympathy with the passive resister so long as he complained of Anglican doctrine being imparted to Nonconformist children, and on every occasion he and his friends on those benches had done what they could to try to remove the grievance. He had undergone more electoral risks in defending the Nonconformist position on this point than any hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House. Hon. Members opposite could take up the Nonconformist position without antagonising any of their own supporters, but when dealing as he was with extreme Catholics he was constantly being misunderstood. Over and over again Nationalist Members had had to face a perfect cyclone of vituperation and abuse because they stood not only for their own religious convictions, but also for those of the Nonconformists. What was the so-called settlement under this Bill? The money was to be pooled and then left at the disposal of the different denominations. He had spoken of the Catholic priest who went about the Scotland division every Sunday begging for his school. There was no doubt that he was entitled to a large voice in the government of the school, but it was not the Catholic position that he was entitled to the whole voice. They wanted a Catholic school, but they had never claimed that they should be subject to clerical management alone. The Amendment of his hon. friend substituted popular control and this Liberal Democratic Government proposed that they should have clerical control. That was an extraordinary position. They were asked to pay 15 per cent. more for the so-called privilege of being made the pariahs of education in this country. He acknowledged that the Government had been generous and humane to Catholics in certain respects, and he thanked them for it to that extent. When the proposals of the Government were put forward he said to his friends that the inequality and inferiority of the Catholics would not end with education alone. It would run through all the life of the school and shut out from the broad, generous atmosphere of national life; it must be stunted and starved. A friend of his said that that had happened already in Scotland, where a portion of the relief fund which had been wisely allocated for the relief of children in the schools had stopped in the national schools and had not reached the Catholic schools. That was a revival of the spirit of the old penal law. Sweeten it with whatever generosity of sentiment they might express it was a badge of educational inferiority on the children of Catholics because they adhered to their Catholic convictions. It was a strange going back in history when a Liberal and Democratic Government in this age of progress and toleration told the Catholics of the country that they should have education according to their conscientious convictions, but in order to remind them that they were still in a position of religious inferiority as Catholics in a Protestant country they would inflict on them a heavy fine in return for their devotion.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he had the greatest sympathy with the Catholics in the position in which they were placed in regard to their schools. He sincerely hoped that the Government would meet their case by giving them the largest possible grant. It was quite hopeless that they should come on ordinary terms into the national system. Nobody who knew how the Catholic religion was and had to be taught in their schools, could possibly suppose that they could accept the conditions which were accepted in regard to other Churches. With the exception of a few rich people, the Catholics of this country were a poor community, and they had made great sacrifices in providing their own schools. He knew a priest whose income amounted to £20 a month, who spent £17 a month on a school and lived on the remaining £3. While he sympathised with the speech of the hon. Member for Salford he thought it was unnecessary for him to take the opportunity of complaining of an individual Member of the other House, Lord Rothschild, who had been generous, not only to those of his own religion, but to deserving causes of all sorts and should have been exempt from such accusations. The tale repeated was moreover, he believed, a pure invention. The utmost possible help in the way of pecuniary grants should be given to Catholics, with the view of making this settlement acceptable to them.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) in supporting the Amendment said he would ask the Minister for Education to keep an open mind on this matter. Statements had been made as to the cost of contracting-out, which would want careful examination when they came to deal with the figures. He did not pretend that it would be, at any rate at first, £300,000 as had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman. He thought it would be £200,000. But if it was only half of £300,000 it would be an intolerable burden. These were details which must be discussed later. What he wanted to urge was the hopeless position in which these schools would be placed by the working of Clause 3, subsection (3). Clause 3, subsection (3) said—

> "All sums paid to an association under this section shall be applied for the purposes of public elementary schools belonging to the association, but subject thereto, the distribution of these sums and the manner in which they are applied shall be in the discretion of the association."

He contended that those words put the supporters of those schools in an intolerable dilemma. If they carried out improvements on the education from their own point of view they would be ruined financially, and if they refused to carry out these improvements they would be told that they were opposing any advance in education. He, therefore, submitted that if they were to approach this question with any prospect of a settlement, the grants, whatever they might be, must be elastic. He asked the Prime Minister not absolutely to close the door to another solution somewhat on the lines of this Amendment. He confessed there was another reason why he would be very sorry the Amendment was not accepted. Their relations with the local authorities had, with very few exceptions, done an immense amount of good to the Church schools. They had helped the local authorities to realise their position and that had prevented their being cut off from the local authority. He did not believe that the difficulties were insuperable if looked at in a proper light, or that the Amendment would in any way tarnish the formulæ on which the Government relied. Therefore, he hoped that the Prime Minister would not absolutely and finally reject the Amendment which the hon. Member for East Mayo had proposed.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said he had listened with deep interest to the debate and was bound to say a few words on this Amendment because he had felt himself unable to vote for the Second Reading of the Bill. They all desired a solution of this education difficulty, but he thought that they might go too far in trying to secure peace when there was no peace. He represented a large number of Roman Catholic voters, and he had always promised them that he would never support anything which he considered unfair to them. He stood by that promise, and that compelled him to speak a few serious words to the Government and to offer to them a suggestion. The Minister for Education had not only that afternoon but on previous occasions, and also the Prime Minster, given to the Committee the genesis of the Bill. It started from a Nonconformist grievance with which he sympathised. No one could question that grievance; but there had been other grievances as well. It was not the business of the House of Commons to encourage any extravagant conscientious grievances. In his own constituency there were a large number of Roman Catholic schools which had been maintained by the members of that community while they had also been paying the school board rate without a murmur. They had as good ground to rebel as the Nonconformists. Could it be said that the House would listen to those Nonconformists who had rebelled and would not listen to other religious bodies who had to endure as great a wrong but who did not rebel? They all desired a settlement, but not a settlement which would leave at its centre a lasting feeling of a deep wrong. Better wait a little longer than have a settlement which would leave the seeds of a growing discontent. He regretted that the Minister of Education said: "Well, the Roman Catholics will not come into our national system of education. This is the only way they can come in, and therefore they must stay out." Was that so? He would vote against the plan of the Government, whatever grants they proposed to give to the Roman Catholics. He would vote against any great body of schools being shut out from a national system of education. In his own town the Roman Catholic system worked very well. Possibly he had come under disgrace with some of his constituents because he had declined to vote against the Bill of 1902. In all the Catholic schools in Bolton, under that Bill they had had two representatives on the management of the local authority. There was an enormous advantage in getting representation, even if the local authority did not get full control. Strong Nonconformist friends of his had been on the management of these schools and that had been an advantage to them as well as an enormous advantage to the schools. He, personally, had the greatest possible dislike to one-horse clerically controlled schools—no matter to what denomination they belonged, but he contended that great good had been done by the lay representation on the management of these Catholic schools. Why should the Roman Catholics be made, as they would under this clause, to pay the penalty for a so-called peace, by being thrown back on their previous position, which had been acknowledged to be bad? Was it not possible, if they could not get full authoritative control, to secure representation on the management of these schools by means of some *modus vivendi*? He knew that the financial position of these schools and the position of the teachers had been vastly improved by the representation of the local authority on the management since the Act of 1902. The teachers were now able to appeal when necessary to the central authority, and their whole position had acquired added dignity and independence. He was sure that the teachers would be loth to go back to their old conditions. This was not altogether a question of money, although the Roman Catholics had shown that they had cheerfully made monetary sacrifices for their schools, and that they would make those sacrifices again. What the Roman Catholics dreaded was being thrown out of the stream of the national educational life of the country and driven into a backwater, so to speak, which would degrade the educational efficiency of their schools and their own self respect. He asked the Government to consider most seriously whether some compromise could not be arrived at instead of pursuing what he believed was a mistaken policy. He had taken part in some conferences for peace for several years past, but he would not cry "Peace, peace," when there was and could be no peace, and while the proposed settlement would leave a spirit of rancour in the hearts of so many of his fellow countrymen. He thought the solution lay in retaining on the management of the voluntary schools, without full control, representation and participation. That would secure both the interest of education, of the public, and of his Nonconformist friends. What would be the result of handing the money grants over to these associations and not to the separate schools? It would be that his Nonconformist friends would say that they were handing it over to be put into clerical pockets. They withdrew all participation, knowledge, and interest in the schools, and they flung them a sum of money, and said: "Divide this among yourselves." He thought it was a backward step, and he would rather have the conditions under the Act of 1902. It was worth considering whether there was no choice between this proposal and retaining those conditions and going on as at present. He would not support or vote for a Bill which carried with it inevitable injustice to a great mass of his fellow-countrymen.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.) said he had, since he had been in the House, listened to every debate on education in England and Wales with great attention and some amount of wonderment. He had always been anxious to discover what sins the Roman Catholics had committed that they should be penalised under the education system, and he thought he had at last found out what their offence was. The Catholics of this country had committed the unpardonable sin of being a minority. The rejection of this clause, accepted two years ago by the present Government, and now proposed by his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo, meant that they might have many things in England, but there was one thing they were determined not to have, and that was religious equality. With every claim for religious equality came the cry of "Rome on the rates," or something equivalent, but when rates, portions of which were contributed by Roman Catholics, went to the upkeep of schools for other than Roman Catholic children the fundamental question arose of whether it was "Rome on the rates" or "Rates on Rome." Surely the honour and dignity of this great Protestant country, which was engaged in a great Protestant settlement, would require that if Rome was not to be helped from the rates its Roman Catholic subjects should be relieved from the local rates for its educational system. If they were to have principles, and the House did discover them occasionally from time to time, they really ought to have principles which would work both ways. His hon. friend the Member for East Mayo put the whole situation in a phrase which, if there was impartial journalism in this country, would ring throughout it with greater prominence than "Rome on the rates." The hon. Member said—

> "Catholics are to be fined for conscience sake."

They repudiated most strongly the opinion that it was a privilege to stand out of the national system. The hon. Member for Preston at an earlier period of the afternoon took exception to that phrase of standing out of the national system, and made some qualification which perhaps cleared up things; but at all events the Catholic subjects of this country, as the result of conscientious conviction, with the strength of which every Member of the House was perfectly well acquainted, were compelled to stand out of the normal national system, to be an excrescence upon it, and to send their children to schools which from mere financial necessity must be, whatever the self-sacrifice of the teacher, if not inferior in fact, generally regarded as inferior to the general voluntary schools of the country. That was the situation. He did not think the speech of the Minister for Education, in refusing to accept this Amendment, was very happily phrased, although he did not go so far as to accuse him of discourtesy, at any rate of deliberate discourtesy. He must congratulate him upon his new found respect for the House of Lords, based on the vote of a small section of Catholic Peers. He was sure hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite did not regard the House of Lords in all its decisions upon all Bills as acting under plenary and divine inspiration, and at any rate it was a small body of Peers who voted. He did not attach much importance to the decisions of the House of Lords, but the question was as to the general position in regard to the appointment of teachers, and the vote was taken on a clause which was radically different from this one. The Minister for Education said the Catholics possessed a large amount of patronage in their schools, and spoke of their having a preserve exclusively kept for Catholic teachers. He thought he told them that there were something like 5,000 teacherships filled by Catholics under the present system. Might he suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that if the education of this country were conducted on fair and equal conditions the Catholics would not have less than 5,000 teacherships. If there were no tests would the Roman Catholics fill fewer teacherships paid for by public money than the number mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. His own impression was that they would fill a very much larger number. The Minister for Education gave his real reason for his opposition to the clause in the latter part of his speech. He did not confine his opposition to it to any ground of principle or administrative difficulty, but said that the Nonconformist opinion in the country was such as to make it impossible for him to grant the demand involved in the acceptance of the Amendment. If that was so, this part of the Bill dealing with Catholics, this being the final compromise and offer, was to be settled, not by Catholic, but by Nonconformist opinion. They emancipated the Nonconformists in 1829, although they had forgotten the fact. They fought the old religious battles against the Established Church, both in England and in Ireland, side by side with the Nonconformists, and he was bound to say, although, like his hon. friend, he remembered with profound gratitude their action in connection with the Irish University Bill earlier in the session, when he looked at their action on this matter he felt he was almost sorry that they ever emancipated them and gave them seats in this House. Although the Nonconformists always said they sympathised with their point of view, he was extremely sceptical whether they understood it. He was profoundly convinced and persuaded of the sincerity and tenacity with which they held their own principles, but they seemed unable to adjust themselves to their point of view. He would say no more. He did not share their religious prejudices, but he respected them, and he was sorry they could not see their way to support the political principle of equality for which they had historically stood in this country. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to a statement of his hon. friend the Member for South Kerry, on the Scottish Education Bill, to the effect that Catholics in Scotland would be content with an increase of 10s. per head on the 40s. provided by that Bill. The right hon. Gentleman then went on to institute a comparison between the cost of education in Scotland and England, leading to the conclusion that if in Scotland the Catholics would be content with 50s. they ought to be content with the same figure in England. His hon. friend said nothing of the kind; he never said that a grant of 50s. would place these schools on an equality with the State schools in Scotland. The question of principle undoubtedly did come into this matter, but that of money and pecuniary consideration also came in. The President of the Board of Education was not, as he understood it, as completely persuaded of the equity and justice of the settlement as he was before the discussion began. He had the figures before him from the Catholic authorities stating the Catholic point of view, and pointing out the deductions which must be made from the supposed advantage which came in under the pooling arrangement. He took the right hon. Gentleman's statement that afternoon as not expressing the same measure of belief with regard to the Schedule, and as indicating that the Government were prepared to listen to reason and mathematics, if it was not prepared to listen to conscience with regard to the Bill. His hon. friend for the Scotland Division had referred to the passive resistance of their Nonconformist friends, and suggested that if this Bill passed in its present form without facilities for the Catholics of this country, they possibly might take a hint from the action of their Nonconformist friends in the past. From the Catholics of Lancashire, who were largely Irish, he himself would expect a policy of active, and not passive resistance. His short experience in the House had taught him that minorities, whether Catholic or other, got a good deal of sympathy, but no justice. If the Bill was passed in its present form without this consideration for the Catholic conscience, which ought to be respected even in a Protestant country, the Government would carry through their great final settlement with a wrong and injustice, which they had not sought to defend, embedded in its heart. They were stamping the Catholic schools with a sort of broad arrow, and making them the outcasts and pariahs of the national system of education. They did not want to stand outside the system of national educational life, but the Government compelled them to. They side-tracked them and turned them into a backwater. In addition to that, they inflicted upon them a heavy penalty. He could not think that such conditions could form the basis of a real and permanent settlement of this controversy.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he could not allow the debate to close without giving expression to the intense indignation which he knew would be roused among the Irish and Catholic population of this country, by the action of the Government. They all thought towards the end of the debates on the Bill of 1906 that something like a satisfactory solution had been arrived at and everyone regretted that that solution had been upset by the House of Lords. The arrangement arrived at at the last moment between Lord Crewe and the Catholic Members of this House was embodied in the last paragraph of the new clause on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for East Mayo. It was never discussed or voted on either in the House of Lords or this House, the possibility of that discussion being destroyed by the action of Lord Lansdowne and his friends. They had been told by the right hon. Gentleman that he now could not get the consent of the Nonconformist Party to the provisions of Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906, but he himself did not believe there had been so great a change in the opinion of the Nonconformists since two years ago, that they would refuse a way to an all round settlement, because they refused to accept the arrangement made between Lord Crewe and the Catholics of this House. He was not one of those who took it for granted that the sole enemies to Catholic education were the Nonconformists. He had no sympathy with the strong language used against the Nonconformists, because he believed that if the Government gave them a chance they would adhere to the arrangement made when the Bill of 1906 was introduced. If that were the fact, he believed the Catholic community would accept as a settlement Clause 4 of that Bill. He could not, however, forget the action of a certain section of the Church of England, which had been, if he might say so without offence, to the last degree mean and treacherous towards the Catholic community of this country. They had used the influence and votes of the Catholic representatives for the purpose of defending the interests of the Anglican schools, and made common cause with the Catholics for that purpose. When the opportunity came and they made terms for themselves, they threw off all association with the Catholics, and deserted the interests of the Catholic schools. Therefore, if there was to be any condemnation, that section of the Church of England deserved its share. It seemed a tremendous pity when there was in the air and in the breasts of all men a general desire for a permanent settlement of this question, that such an arrangement as that contained in the clause of the hon. Member for East Mayor could not be arrived at. They were told that if this Bill was passed into law it would effect a permanent settlement. It was quite true that certain hon. Members above the gangway voted for the Government on the Second Reading, but so far as other portions of the House were concerned there was nothing like a strong and unanimous opinion in favour of this Bill. The division showed the very reverse. Was anyone prepared to get up and say that no matter what the division might be on the Third Reading this would be anything like a settlement in face of the action of the Leader of the Oppositon? Nobody could attempt to say that there would be educational satisfaction or settlement in this country when so many, both in and outside this House, were opposed to the Bill. They had strongly and bitterly opposed to the Bill the late Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, with a large following, and they had the opposition of the Catholics in that House and throughout the length and breadth of the land. With such an array of political forces could anyone believe that the Bill would leave the question of education in a satisfactory position, or that there would be anything but a renewal of hostilities, discontent, and dissatisfaction? He said, as a Catholic Member of that House, and he thought that it was the opinion of every other Catholic Member, that such a result was a pity. He believed that it was perfectly possible to arrive at a settlement which would be really permanent, final, and satisfactory to all interests and denominations if the Government only took a little time. They had been sitting pretty nearly the whole year through, and within a few days the House must adjourn for Christmas, yet this matter of grave importance, the most important matter that Parliament could deal with, was to be disposed of within a short period. Where was the necessity for this extraordinary hurry? Why should a pistol be put to the head, not only of one party, but of all the parties in the House? Why should the Government say that in two weeks before Christmas Day the question must be settled? There was no reason for this undue haste. He thought that the Government would be far better advised if they sought, not after a hasty settlement, but a real, permanent, general, and satisfactory settlement. He believed that such an all-round and general satisfactory settlement could be arrived at if men were given time; but if the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Minister for Education, like a couple of religious highwaymen, put pistols to their heads and said: "You have got to take what we propose," then he thought that was unreasonable. It was said by some people that Catholics really had a great deal of assurance in asking for any assistance from the Government at all. They were told that in other English speaking countries the Catholic people were not offered any assistance whatever for their schools. But what they did in other countries, he presumed, had nothing whatever to do with educational questions in this country, which was upheld to other countries as an example of broad-mindedness and as a place where, whatever might be the case in other countries, there was freedom of conscience and religious equality for all. That was the attitude taken up by this country. She had no right to refer to America or any of the Colonies, or to any other part of the world, because if she did not want to be regarded as a hypocrite England must act up to her professions and give to all the subjects of the realm and to every religion equal and fair treatment. The Catholics, he was certain, asked for no more. Dr. Clifford constantly quoted the phrase "Rome on the rates," but that phrase was too much like the refrain of some song in a low music hall, and it was an absurd statement if they considered the Church of Rome in connection with her rights. Catholics were entitled in common fairness to justice. He would say to hon. Members whose opinion they generally respected that if Catholics were compelled to pay rates for educational purposes, they were entitled to get some return for those rates. He could understand perfectly well if hon. Gentlemen opposite said: "We regret that Roman Catholics cannot come into the educational system because of conscientious objections, and that therefore they do not get any advantage from the rates which they pay. It is not fair to exact money from people and give them no return for it. We will relieve the Catholic parents of the country from the payment of rates for educational purposes." If that were proposed it would be fair and reasonable. He would like to hear some reason why such a proposal should not be made. And what became of the rates of the Catholics? He was happy to say that they had members of various denominations in the Nationalist Party representing Ireland, and the question of religion was never raised among them. Speaking as a Catholic Member of the House, whose father was a Catholic Member before him, he would say that he had an equal respect for members of all the Protestant denominations. He had as much respect for the opinion of Nonconformist Members as he had for the opinion of Church of England representatives in the House or outside it. He had no feeling of prejudice one way or the other in regard to any of them. He differed from them all inasmuch as they, whatever their particular sect might be, belonged to the one great Protestant religion, with which as a Catholic he could not agree. But it was a monstrous thing to come to the Catholic parents of the country, who were among the poorest and hardest worked citizens in the land, and say to them: "We have made an arrangement by which your consciences will not allow you to send your children to our schools. We respect your opinions; we do not find fault with them; we regret the necessity which compels us to keep you outside; but notwithstanding that necessity you shall pay towards the upkeep of our schools." Why should they say to Catholics that they were not only to be excluded from the schools but that they were to pay rates for the maintenance of schools which they did not use? They would use the money of Catholics for a religion which was entirely foreign to the hearts of Catholics, and was to be taught in the public schools. That in his opinion was a monstrously unfair position. He had no intention of saying anything in the slightest degree disrespectful or offensive to Nonconformists, because he agreed with the hon. Member for Liverpool that Nonconformists had had to suffer in the past just as Catholics had had to suffer in many parts of their history for conscience sake; still, in his opinion, it was a mean thing to take the pence and shillings and pounds of a few hard-worked Catholic workmen and say that the money should be used directly for the teaching of a religion of which these men did not approve. They were to have Cowper-Templeism, on which he was not an authority; he believed that it differed in various localities according to the wishes of the authorities. [AN HON. MEMBER: It is an elastic religion.] He thanked the hon. Gentleman for giving him a true description of Cowper-Templeism; it was now an elastic religion. He did not quarrel with the hon. Member for that. Supporters of that religion admired it probably because of its elasticity. At any rate, whatever might be said of the Catholic religion, it could not be described as elastic. Yet Catholics were to be called upon to pay for a religion which was elastic and repugnant to them. That was something which should be regarded as quite unfair. If hon. Gentlemen opposite admired Cowper-Templeism he did not quarrel with their opinion, but surely they could pay for it. He did not suppose that there was a Catholic who would make it a condition in the educational settlement that a farthing of Nonconformist money or of Church of England money should be spent on teaching the Catholic catechism to a single Catholic child in this land. Whatever their difficulties and troubles might be, Catholics could at least pay for the religion of their children, and they were proud to do so. He submitted that in all fairness the position was untenable, and that it was a mean thing to call upon the Catholics of this country to pay rates for schools which they did not use, and in addition to give them no guarantee whatever that their money would not be used for the propagation of religion in which they did not believe in the faintest degree. He believed that it would be perfectly easy to come to an arrangement on the lines of Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906. He believed that clause would be acceptable not only to the Catholics but to those members of the Church of England who were not accepting the present settlement proposals of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Minister for Education. It was an unfair and a disastrous thing that Catholic or Church of England schools should be separated in the general settlement; they ought to be brought together. He believed that it was quite within the powers of statesmanship to bring all the children of the schools of all denominations into a common scheme, at the same time providing fair and reasonable safeguards for the religious convictions and principles of every denomination in the land. This Bill would not do that; it would bring about no permanent settlement. It might pass; but as sure as it did pass, everybody knew that not many years would elapse before another Government would propose to amend it. There had been tinkering enough with the education question. Other countries in the world were ahead of us. Germany was far ahead of us. And why? Largely because in Germany they had long ago seen the harm of not doing the very thing which he was urging upon the Government to do now. In Germany they had recognised the strength of the claims of the various denominations. They gave Catholic and Protestant equality of treatment, and the result was educational efficiency. It was possible to do that in this country, if there was only time. Let them have some real reason why all this amount of work should be done within a fortnight. What was there magical in the year 1908? There were only a few weeks of it left. Surely next year when men had had time to think, when other people, with all respect to the Archbishop of Canterbury, had had conferences, when the Leader of the Opposition and his party and other sections of the community had had an opportunity, which he supposed they had not yet had, of considering the whole question, would not that be time enough to bring in this Bill? No. Let the truth at once be told about this matter. The Government were resolved to carry this Bill by the guillotine, by stifling discussion, within the compass of three or four days, practically before Christmas, because they knew that every day that passed by showed fresh recruits flocking to that already not inconsiderable army which could not possibly accept the present proposals of the Government. If this Bill were postponed until next year it would be found on further consideration that when the Leader of the Opposition rose to speak he would speak for the majority of the Members sitting behind him, and that the number of Nonconformists who were opposed to this settlement would have increased. The Government knew this and felt that if the matter was to be carried through at all it must be carried through at once before men had had time to think and to investigate the matter. Was there a matter in England upon which the constituencies felt more strongly, and in which they took a deeper interest than this school question? Was it an unreasonable thing considering that it had been sprung on the country suddenly without any warning——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (Mr. CALDWELL, Lanarkshire, Mid.): Those remarks apply to the discussion that took place on Friday on the Resolution allocating the time of the House. They do not apply to this Amendment.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he wished only to ask, if the Amendment could not be accepted, whether the Government would not agree to postpone the whole matter so that Members of all parties would have an opportunity for a week or so at least of consulting their constituents and holding meetings and of really getting at the true pulse of the country. He supposed it was idle to expect that the Government would accept the Amendment. It would probably be defeated by a very large majority. He deeply regretted it. He was absolutely certain that the Government was throwing away a great opportunity, an opportunity which nearly arrived in 1906 and which was bound to come with patience and with a certain amount of consideration and time, an opportunity of bringing about a settlement which would satisfy every denomination. He did not believe this settlement would really satisfy anything like a majority of any denomination.

*MR. STUART (Sunderland) said he was one of those who regretted that the Bill of 1906 did not pass, and more particularly because the clause which was reproduced in this Amendment, in his opinion, met adequately the situation of the Catholic Members. Whether it was possible to revert to that or not he could not say. It must depend upon the Government. He presumed it was no part of the arrangement which they had made with the Church of England. He did not wish to see the Bill postponed or thrown aside, because he believed moderate representatives of both sides of opinion had come so near to a conclusion that it was well that they should proceed. But under these circumstances the Catholic community was being left out in the cold. It could not be included in any solution such as this Bill appeared to offer in its present form. It had very peculiar claims to consideration. The Nonconformists and the Church of England were both Protestant. They were at one in their belief in the open Bible both as a means of education and as a religious advantage. But the Roman Catholics differed from them *toto cœlo*. They upheld that it was unsuitable for education, that it was unsuitable for the laity. However much they might differ from that point of view that was their point of view, and they held it conscientiously. When the Protestant communities got rid for some time of this educational quarrel by an agreement among themselves, surely it would be a great mistake if these two great parties in the State did not take into account the position of their Roman Catholic friends and endeavour to invent something which should meet their difficulties too. If they were going to have a solution between the two parties he did not at all side with those who thought that such a solution would break down easily. The moderate people on both sides were tired of this constant educational quarrel. Extreme people would never come into any agreement, but they would have to accept it when it was made. He believed they had a solid mass of the people willing to combine with the moderate people on both sides. When they were going to get a solution of the question which affected themselves and their point of view, let them not be so selfish as to leave their Roman Catholic friends out in the cold. They would do well to turn their minds to what they could do to meet the Roman Catholic difficulty. There was no doubt that the Amendment would meet that difficulty, if it were applied to the Roman Catholics alone. They ought on both sides of the House to be willing to have something of the kind done to meet them, though it was on a different line from what met the difficulty they were trying to meet by their mutual concessions. He had no doubt that would settle the question as far as they were concerned. If the Government could not give them that solution let them turn to some other form of solution, and there were other forms. There was the simple pecuniary solution. Let them give the Catholics something which would meet their difficulties, because they were the poorest community in England and the Church was the richest. If they wanted to avoid everything of the character of religious persecution, if they wanted to have toleration as it ought to be but was too seldom understood, they ought to recollect that the Catholics were separated from them by a definite gulf. They did not all like Cowper-Temple teaching or Church of England teaching, but they were on the opposite side of the division line from that on which the Roman Catholics stood. He pressed upon the Government that they would injure the settlement if they left the Catholics out of it. There was still an opportunity to devise something. He did not believe it was wise to adhere to the Bill and the Government ought to be in a position before they came to the Report stage, if they could not support the Amendment, to deal with the question in some way so that they might not make an agreement between themselves and leave the poorest part of the population outside it.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said the hon. Member for East Clare, speaking of the conduct of the Archbishop and some of his hon. friends, said that in his judgment the Church of England was guilty of mean and treacherous conduct in making a settlement for itself without regard to the equal claims of the Roman Catholics. He should himself, having repeatedly in the course of three successive Education Bills, though not a strong denominationalist, advocated the claim for equal treatment amongst all denominations, think he was guilty of mean and treacherous conduct if, because the Archbishop of Canterbury was, rightly or wrongly, of the impression that he had made a settlement which as far as the Church of England was concerned was satisfactory, they were to eliminate from that settlement Roman Catholics, whose case was precisely similar to that of Churchmen. The last speaker had made the curious observation that the Catholics, as far as this grievance was concerned, stood in a position alone, and he certainly suggested that no similar grievance was felt by members of the Church of England. Such an argument seriously put forward after three sessions of stormy Parliamentary debate simply filled one with despair. He held on this question a brief no more for the Church than for the Catholic faith, but the one thing that had struck everyone in the whole course of the debate had been that the denominational position, if it had ever rested on strong ground at all, had rested on this ground, that no man, no matter of what faith, had a right to impose by force upon a third party his own will and his own view of what another man ought to believe. That was the whole case. Practically it was equivalent to a man saying he believed a certain thing and others ought to. The only comment one could make upon that point was that if the Catholic position was right the Anglican position was also right; the Catholic position was right, not because of its disparity in relation to Cowper-Temple teaching, but on the broad ground that the adult citizens of a free country had a right to form their own opinion in religious matters. Approaching the question from this point of view he had been struck by some observations from the hon. Member for East Mayo, who, in a most moderate and well-reasoned speech, expressed the opinion of Roman Catholics on the subject. A very considerable amount of abuse had been directed against the House of Lords for their attitude in regard to the last Education Bill, but nevertheless hon. Members to-day had been quite ready to express their satisfaction with Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906 as it left the House of Lords. Hon. Members below the gangway were so far contented with that clause that they were quite ready to introduce it now into this Bill in the form of an Amendment.

MR. DILLON said that Clause 4 had a very tangled history. The clause he had introduced was not quite the same. The House of Lords made certain alterations which did not satisfy the representatives of Catholics. Consequently the Ministry made further alterations in response to their request which made the clause satisfactory after it had left the Lords.

*MR. F. E. SMITH replied that it was a long clause, and he thought he was right in saying that when the clause referred to left the House of Commons the Leader of the Irish Party referred to it as an insult. Lord Crewe also in another place distinctly stated that Clause 4 in its altered shape would never have been accepted by the Government unless it was forced upon them by the House of Lords. Therefore, this concession was made in consequence of Amendments introduced in the House of Lords and accepted by the Government in the course of the pressure brought to bear in another place. No one could fail to respect both the tact and the patience which the Minister for Education had brought to bear on educational problems, and this was a refreshing contrast to his predecessor in office. He had, however, been struck with the argument of the right hon. Gentleman in which he stated that if he had attempted to apply Clause 4 to the present Bill he could not have carried the Nonconformists in the country with him. Where did that declaration land them? At the time of the passing of the Bill of 1906 did they not carry the Nonconformists with them? It was claimed at that time that the clause did carry the Nonconformists of the country with the Government, and now in a Bill which represented a compromise and was giving better terms, they were told that they could not have the same clause because it would not carry the Nonconformists with the Government. This question must be determined on grounds of principle. The question was whether it was right or wrong, and not whether the Government could carry the Nonconformists with them. The right hon. Gentleman would act wisely to remember that many powerful Ministers in great controversies had thought it convenient to inquire whether they could carry the Roman Catholics with them. If it was to resolve itself merely into a process of counting heads in the country he was not at all certain that the arithmetic of the Government was very reliable. Was the right hon. Gentleman sure he was right in saying he could not carry the Nonconformists with him? He premised his observations by saying he was not at all sure that the Government were carrying the Nonconformists with them in large numbers on the lines of the proposed settlement.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The hon. Gentleman need be under no apprehension on that point. I would not have acted without Nonconformist support.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said he was not attempting to attenuate the concession which the Nonconformists had made, but, so far as the country was concerned, as distinguished from Nonconformists in the House of Commons, he was not sure that the right hon. Gentleman was not too sanguine. The Nonconformist grievance was embodied in the formulæ "Not one penny of public money without public control," and "No clerical interference with the schools." But here they were giving £600,000 a year to a few clerics, and it made not the least difference whether the money was paid out of rates or taxes. This money was going to be spent without the fullest control; as a matter of fact they handed over £600,000 to a few priests controlled by an Archbishop, without any pretence whatever that any control was going to be exercised. That was how the Nonconformist grievance was going to be removed. He approached this question with a genuine desire that there should be a settlement. With regard to passive resisters, what was the only logical ground upon which passive resistance was based? It was a ground which had much in it, and one that appealed to every person who felt pain when he saw people undergoing imprisonment and suffering for conscience sake. The grievance was that a man was forced to pay a rate for the teaching of a religion which he regarded as pernicious. In that sense in the single-school areas there was a real grievance felt by Nonconformists who paid the education rate, but that grievance was nothing like so real as that which was endured by the Roman Catholics. The substantiality of the grievance complained of by the Nonconformists was nothing when contrasted with the grievance of the Roman Catholics. It was either right or wrong to make a man pay a rate to teach a religion in which he did not believe. They had been told that it was a cruel and intolerable wrong, and therefore, he asked those who held that opinion to apply it to the position of the Roman Catholics. Why was it not a cruel wrong to Catholics when it was admitted that their faith was removed from Cowper-Temple teaching by a gulf infinitely greater than that which separated Cowper-Temple believers from the doctrines of the Church of England? Catholics were made to pay the education rate out of their scanty pence. If it was a grievance in the case of Nonconformists which justified them in setting themselves up in organised revolt against laws passed by Parliament; if it was really a grievance which justified passive resistance, what answer was going to be made now by Nonconformists in this House to Roman Catholics when they said: "Here is a rate which presses on our conscience which you are making us pay for the support of schools established for the propagation of doctrines which we believe to be blasphemous, and will imperil the eternal salvation of our children." It was idle that a compromise based upon those lines could or ought to be permanent. The Roman Catholics would be unworthy of being free citizens of a free country if they consented to a compromise which was nothing but a brutal dictation of terms.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) thought the question before the Committee was merely a matter of common sense. We had a national system of education, and the Catholics and other denominations said they could not come into it. [Cries of "No."] Under these circumstances he could see no hardship in saying to them: "If you must stand out of the national system, be it so, but you cannot expect to have the whole of the expenses of your schools paid for by national funds." [Cries of "Why?"] He admitted that the weakness of the position was that there was a certain form of religious teaching in all schools, but he thought it was reasonable to say: "We will pay for all secular education in your schools and leave you to pay for religious instruction." He had always been in favour of a secular system. He was education inspector for a good many years in India. The Government schools in that country were purely secular, but there were schools which wanted a denominational atmosphere, and to them a grant was given which was supposed to represent the full cost of secular education only. He did not find that those schools suffered from being cut off from the main stream of national education, and he could not see why schools that contracted-out under this Bill should suffer. He would be in favour of an extremely liberal grant increasing according to the amount spent on the school. They ought to be encouraged to make their schools efficient. He could not see why these schools should suffer in the smallest degree; they would be open to the advantages which other schools enjoyed in the way of scholarships. They would have their own management and their own masters, and he did not see why the schools should be looked upon as inferior. He was in favour of contracting out. He did not want the whole of the youth of England to be brought up on the school board pattern. He did not want them to be fed altogether on Cowper-Templeism. He respected the Irish Catholics for their attachment to their schools, and if they were fairly treated in the matter of grants, they would be put on a proper footing.

*MR. GWYNN (Galway) said the discussion had gone on for several hours and he had listened to the whole of it. Not a single Member had risen to reply to the arguments of the hon. Member for East Mayo. The hon. Member who had just spoken was the first speaker to defend the proposals of the Government, but it was a singular defence. The hon. Member did not defend the scheme whole-heartedly, because he was in favour of secular education. Moreover, he admitted that the Protestant religion in some form or other was now to be taught in all schools, and, therefore, Catholics could not be on a basis of religious equality. While the hon. Member was in favour of contracting out he postulated an expanding grant to cover the whole cost of education other than religious education; but the grant proposed was strictly limited and notoriously inadequate. That was the first time that he had taken part in an English education debate, and he hoped it would be the last, for this was a discussion in which the very name of logic was out of place. The right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill admitted that it was bad logic, and commended it to the House on that ground. That was the extraordinary advantage of English Ministers, possessed by them more than anybody else in the world. If a scheme was logical they defended it on account of its logic; if it was not logical they said that it was in harmony with the British nature and the British Constitution. In this case bad logic was not a very good foundation on which to rest the Bill. They were now dealing with proposals which were the result of an arrangement entered into behind the backs of the House. It was an arrangement of which English Members on both sides of the House might complain. But in the negotiations which had taken place those for whom he spoke had no representation at all. When he came to examine the reply of the Minister for Education to his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo what did he find? The right hon. Gentleman did not object on principle to the argument of his hon. friend, but said that the fact was that the Nonconformists of this country were against it. What he expressed was not argument but a conviction, and a conviction for which no reasonable argument could apparently be alleged. Such a conviction was in truth only a prejudice. When the right hon. Gentleman told them that he could not carry the Nonconformists of England in this matter, he wished to know whether Nonconformist opinion had really been sounded. Was it possible that it was determined to deny in 1908 what it was prepared to concede in 1906? Had the right appeal been made to the Nonconformists in that House? Already this session the Chief Secretary had appealed to them not without success, and he now appealed from their Nonconformist prejudices to their Liberal principles. The whole contention of his hon. friend was based on Liberal principles. It was the desire of Catholics to be part and parcel of the democratic system, but the desire of the Government was to hand them over to the most extraordinary piece of clerical machinery ever propounded by a Liberal Government. Had the Nonconformists been approached and reasoned with in this matter? From the point of view of higher statesmanship was it desirable to introduce into the body politic such a division as would be introduced by these two types of schools? Was that the way that Liberals were going to bring about the union of hearts between Irish and English? He urged the right hon. Gentleman to take a lesson from the success achieved in another matter this session by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and to try to induce the Nonconformists to approach this measure in the spirit of Liberalism and not in the spirit of eighteenth century theology.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said he confessed that he had listened with some disappointment to the speech of the Minister for Education which seemed to him hard, dry, and unsympathetic. The right hon. Gentleman never appeared fully to appreciate the position of the Roman Catholics, which had been set forth with such clearness that evening. But this was not merely, in his judgment, a Roman Catholic question. The Amendment was the only solution of a great difficulty with which they were confronted. He believed that this amended version of Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906 was the right treatment to apply to all the homogeneous schools, both Church of England and Roman Catholic, that needed exceptional treatment. Although many more in proportion of the Roman Catholic schools would benefit by it than the Church of England schools, he believed the Church of England would not grudge that benefit going to the members of the other Church. The case for such treatment was strong for Church of England schools in other than single school areas, but it was infinitely stronger for the Roman Catholic schools. First, because the Roman Catholics had no compensatory advantages to set off against their loss, while the Church of England gained at least the right of entry into the council schools. The Nonconformists also had many compensations, which had been frequently enumerated. But the Roman Catholic schools had not a single gain. In the second place, there was this further point about the Roman Catholic case as compared with the case for the Church of England. The Church of England had under the Bill an alternative course; they might elect either to contract out under the terms offered by the Bill, or to become council schools under popular control. But the Roman Catholics had no alternative. Contracting out was the one thing offered to them.

The council school was closed to them by the barrier of conscience. Therefore, if the Roman Catholics were given this as the one solution of the question, he held that the Government ought to make the contracting out a reality, and offer it on the most generous terms. The Minister for Education spoke of the grossly exaggerated language which had been used, as to the sums which would need to be paid by the Roman Catholics for the maintenance of their schools. As an instance of this he quoted a statement that in London the amount per head payable was £5 18s. He said truly that in this sum were included a large number of other charges. But let them take the figures of the White Paper. There was a very large difference between a 50s. grant and the sum of 94s. which was given in the White Paper as the cost of maintenance per head in London.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The figures given in the White Paper include a number of charges that cannot fall upon the contracted-out schools.

*MR. BUTCHER said perhaps the right hon. Gentleman could tell him what the right figure was.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No.

*MR. BUTCHER said that if the right hon. Gentleman did not know it, he could not be supposed to know it to a shilling or two, but he felt no doubt that the White Paper gave, except for some trifling deductions, the charge for maintenance. They must also bear in mind the progressive rise in cost which had been going on since 1902. Figures supplied to him of a great many voluntary Church schools in London showed that the rise had been as much as 50 per cent. for salaries and equipment. That rise was still going on, and he thought nobody could say that even the sum of 94s. was likely to be under the mark in the next few years. They had been told that fees might be charged, in order to make up the difference, but from all he could learn there were very few Church of England schools which could afford now to ask fees, and the Roman Catholic schools were the very poorest in the country. Indeed, he supposed that if it were not that the Roman Catholics were able to get the services of the religious orders at very much lower wages than the market rate, they could not get teachers at all. The right hon. Gentleman used the argument that in Scotland they found 40s. per head was sufficient for Roman Catholic schools and why should not 50s. be sufficient in England? Well, 40s. per head in Scotland might have kept the schools going, but it should be remembered that in England since 1902 there had been a higher standard of efficiency and equipment all round, and it was impossible to ask schools which had been raised to a higher level to fall back to a lower. The Minister for Education in the correspondence with the Archbishop said that the contracted-out schools were to have a reasonable chance of existence. They ought to have more than that; they ought to have a reasonable chance of efficiency. Why did the Government refuse this solution, which educationally was far better than the contracting-out solution for schools of the homogeneous type that they were considering? He could not help thinking that the reason that they denied it to Roman Catholics was that they feared lest they should admit a certain number of Church of England schools. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] If it was that, it was a most unworthy reason. This contracting-out solution was not, he hoped, the last word of the Government. He came down there with hopes, as one who ardently desired, not through sheer weariness but for other reasons, to come to a settlement of this question. He came with hopes of a compromise being reached which would be a little elastic and that the Government would be prepared to make concessions. After all, contracting-out on the terms now offered was of such a kind that under it religious conviction carried with it civic disabilities. It struck at the parent through the secular welfare of his child. It was a cruel alternative to offer to the Church of England, a cruel necessity to impose upon Roman Catholics. Looking generally at Continental Europe, at the Colonies, and elsewhere abroad, they found that the only countries which had arrived at a peaceful and final settlement of the educational controversy had done so by recognising the great diversity that existed of thought and creed and conviction, and in this country, too, he was confident that the only way to peace would be by the road of toleration.

*MR. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham) did not think that the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for East Mayo, although it was the last form in which Clause 4 was before the Houses of Parliament, was a perfect form. The Amendment was somewhat complicated and depended upon a number of contingencies. It was likely to give rise to a great deal of friction, but still, with all its defects, he preferred it considerably to contracting-out. The real thing which he thought the House wanted to arrive at, and the real thing which the Government would like to arrive at, was some form of clause under which the whole of the future expenditure on educational efficiency should not fall upon the denomination itself, and in the case of the Roman Catholics he thought it was peculiarly necessary that some form of clause should be adopted under which this should not be the case. It had been pointed out by speaker after speaker representing the Roman Catholics that they formed the poorest part of the population of the country, and he was sure they would not think he meant anything offensive when he said that they also formed the most ignorant part of the population. That almost necessarily followed from the fact of their poverty, and if that was so, what a pity it was from the point of view of national efficiency that they should condemn them to a punishment of this kind, under which it would be almost impossible for them from time to time to provide the necessary funds to keep their schools on a level with the schools which had the rates behind them. Might he ask whether this was an essential part of the compromise? If the President of the Board or the Prime Minister assured them that if the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Mayo was carried there would be an end of the compromise, he should feel bound with infinite regret to vote for the Government, because he felt the chief matter was that as between the two great parties to this educational difficulty they should obtain a settlement, but he should be also regretful that the position in which the Roman Catholic and many English schools would be left would not be a convenient one. He did not gather that this question of contracting-out was an essential part of the agreement as regarded the Church of England. Had the Archbishop said: "I insist upon this clause"? The President of the Board of Education did not tell them so as a matter of fact, and he challenged the right hon. Gentleman to say that this question was a term advanced by the Church of England. The Church of England had certain schools which she would desire to have the benefits of the Amendment which the hon. Member claimed for Roman Catholics—homogeneous schools mostly of a high Church or Anglican character. Hon. Members would remember that institutions of this kind were not only permissible in the Church of England but had existed in that Church from the very earliest times, and while the Church as a whole was a Protestant institution, the Catholic part of the Church of England had from the reign of James I. down to the present time been an integral portion of that Church. Therefore, they had the right to claim for the Anglican school of the Church of England the same privileges which Roman Catholics were claiming for themselves. He ventured to say that there was no stipulation on behalf of the Church of England that the contracting-out in Clause 4 should be a portion of the Bill. What about the Nonconformists? The President told them that the view of the Nonconformists was strongly in favour of contracting-out as against Clause 4, but if he was rightly informed he did not think there was anything like a unanimous, perhaps even a preponderating opinion, of Nonconformists in favour of contracting-out as against Clause 4. Perhaps the President was moved by a recollection of what happened during the Bill of 1906. They knew then that Clause 4 gave many searchings of heart to many Nonconformists in the House and in the country, and that they did not like the clause. But a great deal of water had flowed down the Thames since 1906, and both sides of this House had begun to understand the position which was taken up by the other, and the religious denominations of the country were to-day infinitely more sympathetic with each other than they were then. He believed hon. Members on that side of the House more fully understood and sympathised with the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite than they did in 1906, and it seemed to him that after the expressions of opinion they had had that day, there might be a greater understanding which might possibly lead to a more satisfactory compromise. Might he point out one thing, and he addressed himself mainly to his hon. friends on that side of the House. He ventured to say that approaching the matter on Nonconformist principles he thought they ought to prefer some variation of Clause 4 to contracting-out. There were three principles with which the House was well acquainted, which were the great issues of the Education Bill of 1906, viz., public control, no tests for teachers, and no application of public money to denominational purposes. Applying those three tests to the alternative schemes of contracting-out on the one hand and Clause 4 on the other, they had no public control in contracted-out schools, but they had in Clause 4 schools. They necessarily had tests for teachers in both sets of schools and as to the application of public money in each case there was no direct application of public money to denominational teaching, and there was quite as little application in the one case as in the other. If they looked at and took the whole Nonconformist position which was before the country at the last general election he ventured to say that that position was more offended by the contracting-out clause than by Clause 4. He would say just one word upon a point made by the President in regard to the Roman Catholic Church and what it had to say about public control. That was based upon the declaration of Archbishop Vaughan, as the President himself told them, in 1905, before the general election. Well, even more water had flowed down the Thames since 1905 than since 1906, and how could they accept that declaration of Archbishop Vaughan in 1905 before the general election against that of hon. Gentlemen opposite who represented, if anybody did, the feelings and wishes of the Roman Catholic electors of this country? They had some little time before them before this matter was finally determined. It would be a week or ten days before the House would be called upon to give its decision as to the particular relief to be afforded to Roman Catholic members of the community, and he asked the Government seriously to apply their minds to this matter and to try to find out whether, as a matter of fact, Nonconformist opinion was not amenable to some modified form of Clause 4, rather than to the particular form of contracting-out which the Government had in the Bill. He believed they would find that Nonconformist opinion had no more objection to one than to the other, and he thought after the debate they had heard there should be some sympathetic consideration given to the undoubted claims of the Roman Catholics and also of the Anglicans who desired homogeneous schools.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON regretted that the Government would not accept the Amendment. It did not pledge them to adopt the new clause of the hon. Member for Mayo. But it left the door open for the consideration of some alternative to the proposals for contracting-out, which were so generally unpalatable on both sides of the House. The clause of the hon. Member for Mayo was not Clause 4 of the Bill of 1906 as it left the House of Commons, but was that clause as it returned from the House of Lords. In the House of Lords there were two additions made to it, very desirable to his mind, in regard to the constitution of the parents' committee for the control of religious instruction and the requirement that the local education authority should consult the parents' committee in the appointment of teachers.

MR. DILLON said it was very important that this should be made clear. The form in which he had put down the clause was not that in which it came from the House of Lords, but the form in which it was adopted after the debate in the House of Lords by the Liberal Government.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON was understood to say that the clause was the result of discussion in another place, and these two particular sections of the hon. Member's proposed new clause to which he had referred were printed in italics showing that they had not stood part of the clause as it left the House of Commons.

MR. DILLON said they were not put in by the House of Lords.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he did not think they need argue about it. If hon. Members would look at the clause they would see that these two particular subsections were printed in italics showing that they were not the product of the debates of the House of Commons.

MR. DILLON said the matter was of some importance. It was quite true that the clause was altered, but the shape in which he had put it down was not the form in which it had come from the House of Lords, but the form in which it was adopted by the Government, as announced by Lord Crewe, after debate in the House of Lords. It was the work of the Liberal Cabinet and not of the House of Lords.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that as the Bill came back from the Lords certain portions of the clause were printed in italics to indicate that they had not formed part of the clause as it left the House of Commons. He did not wish to carry the discussion further, but while admitting that the clause was not discussed in the House of Commons in 1906, he did not understand why, if it was accepted by the Liberal Government in the House of Lords then, the Minister for Education should be so reluctant to consider it now. Whether or not it should be accepted, it would give the opportunity for considering whether there should be an alternative proposal to contracting out. Probably the right hon. Gentleman would say there was not time enough, but that was no fault of the Opposition. They were told they were being conciliated, but that was being done under the guillotine, a curious process of conciliation. They must make the best of the position, and take their chance of any opportunity that offered of discussing this very complicated Bill. This Amendment would offer to the Roman Catholics a possibility of escaping from a very distasteful position. To them complete popular control and the appointment by the local education authority of the teachers without reference to their religion must be an impossible condition. The Roman Catholics gained nothing under this Bill, the Church of England gained the right of entry for what it was worth, but the Roman Catholics gained nothing and were entitled to the fullest consideration. What was to be their position under the Bill? Were they to be driven into a system that was distasteful to them, which they could not possibly accept, with the alternative of starvation under the contracting-out clause? Another question the Government had not taken up was that of the homogeneous schools, where the bulk of the children were of one religious belief, and where that particular religious belief might be provided for under the scheme of the school without doing harm to anybody else. If only time had been given to deal with that matter and to arrive at the compromise which conciliation demanded for making a real settlement, they might have been able to have struck out some scheme covering the whole ground, but they had not had that opportunity. This Amendment would give the Department the opportunity for offering the possibility of escaping from unpleasant alternatives, and he appealed to the Government not to let the opportunity escape. It was said that contracting out would bring variety, but the variety they wanted was the variety arising from adaptation of teaching to local needs and conditions; they did not want the variety between rich and poor schools, between efficient and non-efficient schools. He asked the Government, in the hope of a real settlement of the matter, to give full consideration to the Amendment.

MR. MADDISON said two things had emerged from the debate. The first was that the prospect of anything like a durable settlement was not a good one, and the second that the equality of treatment was not to be obtained, either by contracting out or by the proposal of the hon. Member for East Mayo. Equality could only be reached by excluding entirely all theological teaching. As one who had moved about the big towns of England, he knew that all that had been said by hon. Gentlemen from Ireland about the self-sacrifice of their own priests and of those who managed their own schools was true. They were poor, very earnest, and very determined. As he happened to belong to a religious minority very much removed from them —he had the privilege to be an Unitarian—he sympathised to the full with the plea they made on account of the poverty and earnestness of their people. He would like hon. Members from Ireland to understand the position, which was that he and other English Radicals must steadily resist their attempt to impose denominationalism upon public money. Across the track of a national educational system came great external bodies, it might be from Rome, from Canterbury, or from Geneva. If he had his way, he would not allow any of them to interfere with the national system, for if such interference were permitted it broke up the amity of that system and kept alive that bickering which was not good for education, nor, he thought, for religion. If hon. Members from Ireland—whose objection to Cowper-Templeism he shared—had joined them some time ago, the chances were that the Catholics and other bodies might have had a hand in this bargain, or treaty of peace, and without outraging a single conscience they might have devised a system by which facilities should be given for denominational teaching out of school hours. After these weary debates, these abortive proposals, these hopeless attempts to secure reconciliation among irreconcilables, the nation would one day turn to a system which would make the schools absolutely neutral in those matters which must divide us on this side of the grave.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN recognised, as the hon. Member who had just spoken recognised, that the solution which the Government proposed could not meet the idiosyncrasies of small religious bodies. To meet the views of everybody was possible only by taking the course recommended by his right hon. friend, that, without prejudice, the State should provide the religious instruction which parents desired. But if they could not do that, it was not necessary to go to the other extreme and provide no religious teaching whatever. If they could not provide what everybody wished for, that was no reason why they should provide what nobody wanted. He intended to support the clause, whether the Amendment were carried or not. He did not like the clause which the hon. Member for East Mayo had put upon the Paper; but he shared the view of the hon. Member for Oxford University that they ought not, at this stage of the Bill, to exclude the possibility of reaching in their deliberations some scheme more palatable to many of their fellow-citizens.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 159; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 421.)

AYES.

Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, RtHn Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos.H.A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Alexander
Delany, William
Dillon, John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbighs)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William

Mr. Maddison.

Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Harwood, George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen'sCo.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oddy, John James
O'Doherty, Philip
O' onnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehy, David
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agar-Robartes, Hon, T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J. T. (Chesh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp

Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren,Rt.Hn.Sir C.B.(Leics)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Hussey, Thomas Willans
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel,Rt.Hn.H.L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason.John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 27th November, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of Clause 1.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 238; Noes, 144. (Division List No. 422.)

AYES.

Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J. F. L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Rt HnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc
Chance, Frederick William
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane,Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry

Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coates, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred

Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Rt Hn. Sir C. B. (Leices.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Donc'st'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Rt. Hn. H. L. (Cleveland)

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive

Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.

Clive, Percy Archer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Alexander
Delany, William
Dillon, John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Captain Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oddy, James John
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Percy, Earl
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Radford, G. H.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehy, David
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Whereupon the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment of Parliamentary Grants to associations of schools in respect of every public elementary school belonging to such associations, and of a Parliamentary Grant in respect of instruction given in special subjects at centres, in pursuance of any Act of the pressent session to make further provision with respect to Elementary Education in England and Wales."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question put forthwith, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 27th November, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL (BY ORDER).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [17th November], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said he rose to move the rejection of the measure. It was long and complicated. It proposed among other things to take over several existing railway companies and place them under the control and authority of the North British Railway Company, also to build new lines and take over docks and harbours. In the provisions of the Bill the interests of various people were carefully safeguarded—the interests of the shareholders in the railways affected, the interests of the Postmaster-General, the interests of traders and shippers, of harbour dues and carrying rates, the interests of the ratepayers of Leven, and so on. But there was one class of people whose interests were not safeguarded. Under the Schedules it was specified that the North British Railway Company should appoint and pay all agents, officers, booking and other clerks, servants, porters and other persons and so on who were working the railway. He desired some assurance that the interests of the servants of the company taken over under the Bill should be safeguarded and their rights as citizens protected in a way that the present employees could not be said to enjoy. The company had a standing rule that all its employees must be at its disposal not merely during the working hours, but during the whole twenty-four hours of the day. That had been interpreted to mean that a servant of the company was prohibited from serving on any public body to which he might be elected, although its meetings were held during the hours when he was not on duty. They were not asking that servants of the railway company should be free to accept public positions which called them away from their duties during working hours, but they felt strongly on the point that during the time they were not on duty these men should be as free to accept positions of trust and responsibility to which they might be elected as any other members of the community. What they asked was that an assurance should be given of a definite kind that what had already happened in connection with the town council of Ladybank should not be repeated with the new people contemplated to be taken over under the Bill. Six members of the town council of Ladybank were employees of the company, and each had been compelled under threat of dismissal to resign his position on the council. A deputation of townspeople, including the provost and the parish minister, waited upon the manager of the company to plead the cause of these men, but the manager was obdurate and insisted that he had a right to control the whole of their time. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade had read at Question-time a letter from the manager in which this sentence occurred—

> "The company has no intention to enforce any restriction upon its employees to prevent them serving the town council so long as such service is not inconsistent with their duty to the company."

It was not, however, alleged that the fact that these six men were acting on the town council in any way interfered with their duty as railway servants. The town clerk was also local agent to the railway company, and some of these men had occasion to criticise some charges he made for services alleged to have been rendered, and two days following their criticism the leader of the six was warned to resign from the council under pain of being dismissed. He had to resign, and the other five followed in quick succession. Since then two employees of the company who acted as chairman and secretary of the ratepayers' association had also been compelled to resign under a similar threat, which was actually carried out in the case of the chairman. This was a condition of servitude which would find little sympathy and no support, he hoped, in any quarter of the House. Unless satisfactory assurances were forthcoming they would do their best to defeat the Bill, or failing that, to have clauses inserted to safeguard the rights of citizenship of the employees of the company. They would fight strenuously if necessary to secure that railway servants should not be deprived of the rights of citizenship so long as the exercise of those rights did not conflict with their duty to the company.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland), in seconding, thoroughly agreed with the statement that no company ought to have the right of interfering with the rights of citizens. If a man went to a meeting of any kind in his own time, no company had a right to say he should not do it, and that if he did he would be dismissed. He rather thought they would not go so far as that in Russia or any other uncivilised country. If a company got favours from the State and a monopoly with regard to its business it had no right to say that men should not do so-and-so in their own time. He had been informed that this company proposed to take Leven Harbour or Dock and close it, or do what they pleased with it, without any recompense to the real owners, and that the clause referring to that had been put in without the usual notice which enabled parties concerned to defend themselves. That was another reason why they should carefully look into this Bill. Another complaint that had reached him was as the way in which the company kept their spare engine-drivers and firemen hanging about. The men complained that after hanging about all day they were not fit to do a night's work on a locomotive; that it was a danger not only to themselves, but to the public. He hoped the President of the Board of Trade would see that not only the men but the public were protected from dangers which might arise from that cause. His main object, however, in intervening was the question of third-class sleeping carriages. As long ago as 1882 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, stated that whenever a public company came to get favours and monopolies granted to them by Parliament the public had a right to see that their grievances were redressed before further favours were granted. Not only had nothing been done with regard to third-class sleeping accommodation, but the company had actually raised the price of week-end tickets by 20 per cent. The railway company said the first-class sleeping carriages did not pay, but everybody knew there was a loss on all first-class traffic. That loss had to be met out of the profit made on third-class traffic. That was a reason why third class passengers should be treated at least as well as those who travelled first-class. He could not see why the sleeping accommodation given to first-class passengers should be paid for by third-class passengers. He gladly recognised that the Board of Trade had tried to assist him in this matter, and he hoped to have their further assistance. He warned the railway companies that some night it would be possible to punish them by throwing out a Bill. He was told that the North British Railway Company had not been doing very well. He found on inquiry that that was entirely their own fault. It was due to their own bad management. They had wasted a million of money in building a great hotel at Edinburgh, they had wasted other millions on useless undertakings, and then they had the impudence—he used the word advisedly—to come to Parliament and say that the public must pay for the loss they had incurred. His constituents were very much interested in the claim that the railway companies should be required to provide third-class sleeping accommodation. They were about 700 miles distant, and he wished them to have reasonable opportunity of coming to London in comfort. Unless he got a satisfactory reply he would insist on going to a division. The public had a right to demand for third-class traffic similar accommodation to that given to first-class.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said the hon. Member for Sutherlandshire was asking a little to much when he asked for third-class sleeping carriages. If such carriages were provided, the trains would be inconveniently long. If the railway companies could afford to give the accommodation asked, he would not object, but he did not think the suggestion was practicable. He wished to call attention to a more serious matter. An alteration was made in the night mails from Aberdeen, whch meant that the delivery of letters from his own and other northern constituencies was delayed in the South until the following day. Their conveyance took forty-eight instead of twenty-four hours. He made representation on the subject to the railway companies, and through the good offices of the Secretary to the Board of Trade they had met the request made to them in this respect. A conference of railway representatives was held, and the result was that the companies had agreed to restore the mail service to what it had formerly been, the alteration to take place in the beginning of May. He was bound to say that the North British Company met them quite fairly. He could understand the difficulties they were in. Although their station in Edinburgh was large, it was not all that could be desired, and it was not an easy matter arranging the traffic. He desired to thank his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Trade for the ready assistance he had given in the matter.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of TRADE (Sir H. Kearley, Devonport) said the House would remember that the debate on the Second Reading of this Bill was adjourned in order that the conference to which his hon. friend had referred, might be held. He was glad to be able to confirm the statement made by his hon. friend. The railway companies had agreed not precisely to the arrangement existing before but to restore the mail connection so that those districts north of Aberdeen which were cut out would now be able to enjoy the mail service in the same way as they had done for many years past. The hon. Member for Sutherlandshire had brought forward a topic which he had been pressing on the attention of the House for the past three years. He hoped the hon. Member recognised that the action of the Board of Trade in the matter had been sympathetic. In 1906 when the question of third-class sleeping accommodation was raised, he undertook to approach the managers of the various railway companies which ran trains long distances with the view of seeing whether they could be induced to give their favourable consideration to the suggestion. The Board of Trade had been unable to induce them to make the concession. The companies pointed out that the provision of third-class sleeping carriages would involve a financial loss. Not being satisfied his hon. friend again brought up the question in 1907, and he himself then supported the idea that third-class sleeping accommodation should be provided. He pointed out that the third-class passenger was really the backbone of railway traffic, and that he enabled the railway companies to pay dividends. The figures showed that third-class passengers were enormously greater than the second and third-class. He was not able to do more, but if the hon. Gentleman took the opportunity to move a Motion or introduce a Bill, so as to let the House of Commons have a formal debate on the matter, and if the decision of the House of Commons was in favour of his hon. friend's action, then he was certain the railway company would reconsider the matter.

*MR. MORTON: Will the Government give me time to bring in and carry a Bill?

SIR H. KEARLEY said that the hon. Gentleman knew how to take advantage of every opportunity which offered of bringing this matter before the House of Commons, as had been shown by his heroic record in connection with the tramways. With regard to the point raised by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil—viz., the treatment by the railway companies of their servants who took part in municipal affairs—when this Bill was under discussion a fortnight ago he promised that he would take advantage of the directors of the North British Railway Company being present, to act as a friend at Court as between the Company and the men with regard to this grievance. He had placed the case which had been stated to him by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil by letter, before the general manager and directors of the Railway Company, and at their request he sent a copy of that letter to the general manager. He had had an interview that day with the general manager, and asked him for an assurane that in future no such interpretation would be placed on the standing rule of the company as to prevent employees, when their services were not required by the company, exercising their rights of citizenship; and he was now able to give, on behalf of the company, an assurance on these terms—

> "The directors of the North British Railway Company authorise me to say that the employees of the company shall be left free to discharge public duties, and to exercise freely their rights of citizenship during those hours when they are not on duty for the railway company."

He hoped that the hon. Member after that assurance would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said he wished to move that the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons with respect to Clause 26, which dealt with the closing of Leven Harbour. The Commission in settling this clause dealt with new matter of a very important character, but no previous notice of it had been given to the owner of the Solum at Leven Harbour. They did not want to override their system of Private Bill legislation by any general rehearing or revision, but it was an entirely different matter to order the hearing of a point which had not been heard. Mr. Christie had not seen the plans of the works to be placed on the land, and he was inclined to agree with him that this House ought to grant a rehearing. He was fortified in that contention by what the Lord-Advocate said in the Arizona case, in which the right hon. Gentleman said he did not find any suggestion that the matter was not argued in full previously, or that any new fact was brought before this House. In effect he said there must be some new facts brought forward to those which were before the Commissioners, or some gross blunder proved to have been made by the Commissioners, before such a rehearing would be allowed. He contended that here there were new facts, that these facts were of very great importance, and that such protection as the clause granted to Mr. Christie in his absence, and his compensation, and his mineral rights, should be properly safeguarded. He was entitled to have a rehearing with the plans and sections of the jetty and all these works presented for consideration. He did not think Mr. Christie had made any unreasonable request. He would not discuss the various points at length, but would content himself with making this general statement. He begged to move that the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire) seconded. He said he did not think it was necessary for him to add much, but it seemed to him that special care ought to be given to the proposal to close one of these East of Scotland ports, and to enable one of the railway companies to set aside the obligations imposed under an Act of Parliament. This port was constituted in 1876, the Leven Harbour Company being the undertakers. Then it was passed on to somebody else, and from that somebody else it passed in 1889 into the hands of the North British Railway Company. From that time the railway company had neglected the obligations by which their rights were accompanied, viz., to keep the harbour open and in a fit condition to be used by vessels. They neglected to do that, and the harbour gradually silted up. Then the proprietor of the soil, from whom they bought, insisted upon their fulfilling their statutory obligations, and went to the Court of Session. That Court pronounced against the railway company, and issued an order to the effect that the place should be kept properly, and that the proprietor should be entitled to keep it in order himself and charge the railway company. The company did not appeal from that decision, but came before the House of Commons with a Bill, and by a clause got rid of their obligations, altogether overriding the decision of the Court of Session. The proprietor had had no opportunity of stating his case, and under these circumstances he supported what the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs had said. He believed there was one precedent in a similar case, but he need not go into it; he thought this was a case in which the House might very well refer this particular clause to a Joint Committee in order that it should receive particularly careful attention. He begged to second.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons."—(*Mr. Younger*).

*Mr. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said he appeared for the first time in opposition to the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs and he was glad that it was on a matter of personal and individual rather than of national importance. The hon. Member had referred to previous occasions in which attempts had been made in this House to refer Bills to a Joint Committee, and he candidly stated that there was only one in the history of Provisional Orders in Scotland on which such a reference was made. He thought that was a case where the Edinburgh Tramways Company had applied before the Commissioners for "loans," but it was refused and when they came before this House it was granted. In all the other cases no similar permission had been granted. His hon. fiend had quoted the Lord-Advocate, and he thought that right hon. Gentleman had adopted a very sound argument when he said that no rehearing should take place except under special circumstances. Lord Balfour, who was then Secretary for Scotland, used similar terms, as also did Sir Robert Reid, now Lord Chancellor, and other authorities, who said that no Bills should be sent to a Joint Committee unless there was substantially a special case, and new matter had arisen. This Provisional Order now under discussion came in the ordinary course before the Commissioners who consisted of Lord Falkland and Lord Strathmore and two Members of this House who were very much respected. They heard all the evidence for four days, and went into all these points, and he ventured to say that no special circumstances had arisen which demanded a re-hearing, no new facts had been brought forward and no new point had been raised which was not considered by the Commissioners. Last of all, these four Commissioners were unanimous in arriving at their decision. His hon. friend said that no notice was given to Mr. Christie, but when objections were raised before the Examiner of Bills, an impartial authority, he declared that the Standing Orders had been complied with. Then as to whether the notice was given or not, the North British Railway applied for various powers to deal with this harbour as they wished, to sell it or to do what they liked with it. The Commissioners cut down those powers and said they must make roads, give some land to the borough, and do various other things. The greater included the less and, if the railway company applied for the fullest powers their notice might be held to cover the more limited powers which were conferred upon them by the Commissioners. The question whether Mr. Christie still had some claim was a legal point which the House was hardly competent to deal with. The Commissioners had decided that his case should be kept open and if he could establish his claim the railway company undertook to pay him compensation under the Lands Clauses Act, giving him the full value of his right plus 10 per cent. The Bill did not abolish the harbour. It only closed the dock and for reasons which appealed to everyone in the neighbourhood. Owing to the situation of the dock, within twenty yards of the main sewer, it had been condemned by the public health officer who had been health officer for seventeen years, and who said the dock was a perfect cesspool and was injurious to the health of the locality. The town council said the basin of the dockyard was a filthy nuisance.

*LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): That is not the fault of the dock which was there fifty years before the sewer.

*MR. COCHRANE did not think that made any difference. The dock was no longer required for its previous purpose. The enormous docks of Methil had grown up on which the company had spent millions of money. The Commissioners and the public health authority and the borough authorities were satisfied that Leven Dock ought to be closed and the Leven branch of the Miners' Union had also declared that they desired to see it closed. Only one individual held out and he had been offered full and fair compensation if he could prove any claim to it. No case had been made out for sending the Bill to a joint Committee.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said it was a very small point that had been brought before the House. The hon. Member for North Ayrshire had described with great clearness the situation, and he had very little to add to his statement of the facts of the case. Mr. Christie was the only objector to the Bill, and it was in his interest that the Motion was brought forward. There was no ground of objection on the part of Mr. Christie on the ground of notice. The Examiner of Bills had decided that point and it was perfectly clear. The Commission had heard Mr. Christie's case, which was one of objection to a clause less favourable to his interests than the clause as it at present stood. His case was not that the clause was less favourable but that new facts had been brought forward which were not covered by the notice and which had not been before the Commission. As a matter of fact, neither of these objections held good.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): Was Mr. Christie allowed to be heard on the new clause which was brought forward on the inquiry stage of the Bill?

MR. SINCLAIR: He elected to stand out.

Mr. MOONEY: Did he apply through his counsel, Mr. Scott-Dickson, to be heard on the matter, and did the Committee sitting in Scotland refuse to hear him, or did he allege that there was no power to deal with the clause as it was not contained in the notice?

Mr. SINCLAIR said he had his opportunity of being heard and refused to take it.

Mr. YOUNGER: My information is that Mr. Scott-Dickson refused to go on, because he was not seized of the facts. He had no notice of any kind. The agreement was made behind Mr. Christie's back, and he was not in a position to go on.

Mr. SINCLAIR said he understood it was not made behind his back. The company would have been very glad to treat with Mr. Christie as they had treated with other parties, but Mr. Christie chose to refrain from taking the opportunity which he certainly had of coming to an agreement in the matter. As to Mr. Christie's legal rights, the Commission had come to no decision. Unless there was very grave reason, and there was no such grave reason in this case, the Motion should be rejected.

Mr. MOONEY said it was only to preserve the reputation which had always belonged to Private Bill Committees that he intervened. As he understood it, the reason why the decisions of Private Bill Committees were so unanimously upheld was that any person, no matter how remote his interest, if he could prove that he had an interest which would be affected by any Bill, got the fullest and fairest consideration before any Committee. He understood that Mr. Christie alleged that he was injuriously affected by the Bill as originally proposed. The Committee sat and inquired into the clauses of the Bill, and at the last moment new clauses were brought forward, and Mr. Scott-Dickson, on behalf of Mr. Christie, protested that the Committee were going outside the deposited plans. He should be very sorry to interfere with the decision of a Committee sitting in Scotland to decide a purely Scottish question; but, if they had departed from the ordinary course, laid down by that House, he thought they ought to exercise their revising power, which he admitted only ought to be exercised on rare occasions, and allow the complainant to go before a Joint Committee. He did not think, from their knowledge of Mr. Scott-Dickson, that he would have made the statement attributed to him that the clause inserted in the Bill went outside the deposited plans if he had not thought that was so; but, if the right hon. Gentleman could assure him that Mr. Scott-Dickson was under a misapprehension, he would not support any Motion to send the Bill to a Joint Committee. If, however, there had been a departure from the ordinary procedure, he did not think it would add to the high reputation possessed by Private Bill Committees to allow any individual to go away with the idea that he had been unfairly treated. It would be better to stretch a point and allow that person to appear before a Joint Committee rather than he should think he was suffering under a grievance. Under those circumstances, if Mr. Scott-Dickson was correct, he should vote in favour of the Motion; but if the right hon. Gentleman could assure him that the statement was made under a misapprehension, he should not support the Motion, because he was in favour of delegating these matters to the local people who knew all the circumstances.

*Mr. MORTON said that one of the safeguards against lobbying which the two Houses had established was the very strict regulations as to notice. He understood the railway company were under a statutory obligation to maintain the harbour and dock and were also by the decree of the Quarter Sessions required to restore it to a state of efficiency for public use. In face of that it certainly seemed extraordinary that without the consent of those interested they were going to take the harbour or dock away—to sell or do anything they liked with it—and give no recompense to the owner. He agreed that if anybody felt a grievance—and especially when the ordinary procedure as to notice had been broken—they ought to be as lenient as possible and give redress by allowing them in cases of importance to go before a Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons, and have their case heard. He was very anxious that the strict rules made by both Houses as to the giving of notice and the handing in of plans and other information should be adhered to for the protection of everybody and the prevention of lobbying which would surely occur if they allowed those rules to be broken with impunity.

MR. SINCLAIR said he did not think it was a question of relying on the good faith or character of Mr. Scott-Dickson, or any other counsel engaged in the case. The question really was whether Mr. Scott-Dickson had fair notice of the objections he had to meet. There was no doubt that two authorities in their separate spheres had decided that he had fair notice. In the first place, the Commissioners were decidedly of the view that he had. He was fully heard by them and they came to a unanimous decision. There was the further point whether the notice given by the company in these proceedings covered the form which the clause ultimately took. That was a matter which was referred to the Examiner of Bills, who decided that the notice given to Mr Christie covered what had been done by the Committee. There was really no doubt on these two points.

MR. MOONEY asked if a protest was made by Mr. Scott-Dickson against the competency of the Committee to insert this clause? Was there any ruling given on that point?

MR. SINCLAIR: Certainly. I have just said so.

MR. MORTON: Was the plan referred to deposited with the Secretary for Scotland in time?

MR. SINCLAIR: Yes.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said supposing a man who was interested in some property had not had notice of a Private Bill, if his counsel appeared it was quite clear that it had been waived. Counsel might or might not proceed upon some further point, but if he appeared at all any prior question of notice was waived. The hon. Gentleman opposite had made a mistake in stating that there was no provision here for compensation for Mr. Christie. Subsection (9) of this very clause, said—

> "In the event of Robert Maitland Christie or his successors making any claim in respect of, or interest in, the site in two years, the company is to give him full compensation."

*MR. MORTON: It is said they are going to close the harbour and dock and this man does not want it closed.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said they were not going to take the harbour away but simply to close up the dock. There could only be three people interested in the property. First of all, there was the owner of the dock—the railway company. Then there was the individual who came forward and said: "My predecessors sold this dock site to the railway company for the purpose of a dock, and if it is not going to be used for a dock any longer I claim to have a right in the soil." That was a very curious contention, and he could quite understand that when the Parliamentary notices were originally given no one thought that some individual, owing to some understanding which, he claimed, existed at some remote period was entitled in reversion to have the property back. The question of notice was disposed of and the question of irregularity was disposed of by the careful way in which the officials saw that every interested party had had the proper notice. Who else could be interested in the property? The ordinary persons who lived there and owned property in the neighbourhood were represented by the local authorities who were parties to the Bill. In these cases arrangements were sometimes made by way of concession. Roads were made and pieces of land were given up, but these concessions were not shown on the original plans. It was absurd to say there was anything irregular because all the parties interested had met together and made a sensible arrangement which was included in the Bill. Mr. Christie was to have compensation if he proved his claim and anything fairer or more reasonable it would be difficult to understand. After all the criticism that had been passed on the railway company about points which were not in the Bill it was almost time they allowed these important works, which the railway company was going to carry out, to be authorised.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) entered a word of expostulation against the time of the House being occupied upon the pleading of a private right on such slender grounds. A most extraordinary claim was put forward by the man who sold the dock, and was paid in cash and shares. The dock was thoroughly useless and antiquated, had only a very small draught of water, was not more than an acre in extent, and during the last six years hardly a vessel had come into it except for one firm. It was an attempt by a landowner, through his personal friends, to extort a larger price from the railway company.

Mr. YOUNGER: I have never seen Mr. Christie in my life.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS said he was glad that fact had come out. He had never heard a more flimsy case in his life. He had thought this was a case of an attempt to obtain compensation for which there was no title, and that opportunities were being used which ought not to be used to prevent the passage of Bills in order to promote private interests.

Mr. MOONEY: May I ask whether the hon. Member is in order in attributing motives to Members of the House? I have no connection with and have never seen Mr. Christie.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The intervention of the hon. Member showed that the observations of the speaker were made without knowledge. I understood him to withdraw them.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: Certainly. I am rather pleased that any observations I made were the means by which this fact was brought out.

Mr. William Rutherford.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): May I ask whether the hon. Member is entitled to make insinuations as to the motives which move hon. Members in bringing a matter before the House.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly not. I thought I had made that clear. The hon. Member for Glasgow is not entitled to make observations of that kind. When they were contradicted, I understood him to say he regretted he had made them, and that they were not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: I certainly withdraw immediately any remark which could be at all offensive. I said I was glad the opportunity had arisen in order that the facts might be made known.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE: The suggestion the hon. Member made was that those who opposed this were actuated by personal acquaintance and personal motives. I beg absolutely to disclaim both, and I ask him to withdraw his observation.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS said he had withdrawn the remark. What he ventured to submit was that the time of the House had been occupied at a late hour in the casting of a slur upon the operations of a Committee in Scotland which, in its discussions up to now, had been singularly successful. He thought that they ought to do what they could to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

Question put, and negatived.

Bill to be considered to-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATAL.

Papers relating to the case of Mr. Alfred Mangena.

LABOUR STATISTICS.

Twelfth Abstract of Labour Statistics of the United Kingdom, 1906–1907.

IRISH TEACHERS PENSION RULES, 1879.

Rules under Section 11 of the National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1879.

STATISTICS (COLONIES).

Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates in each year from 1893 to 1907. Forty-fifth Number.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 25th November, 1908, declaring that Henry Restall, explosive worker, Royal Laboratory, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1877.

Order in Council, dated 27th November, 1908, giving effect to rules of Court.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

FRANCIS ERNEST COLENSO, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

Petition of; praying for inquiry into his case, and that he may be heard by counsel or at the Bar of the House; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

TILONKO, A CHIEF OF A SECTION OF THE EMBO TRIBE OF ZULUS.

Petition of; praying for inquiry into his case, and that he may be heard by counsel or at the Bar of the House; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I beg to give notice that tomorrow I shall ask the noble Earl the Leader of the House what Government measures are likely to be submitted to this House during the remaining days of the session, and whether he is able to state approximately the amount of time which His Majesty's Government propose to allot to each of these measures.

LOCAL REGISTRATION OF TITLE (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD ATKINSON: My Lords, this Bill is designed to meet difficulties that have arisen in the administration of the Labourers Act by some local authorities in Ireland. These difficulties have been caused owing to the unfortunate omission, on the part of the solicitors for the bodies concerned, to register the conveyance of the lands purchased for the purpose of the erection of labourers' cottages. The Bill was approved by both sides in the House of Commons, and the circumstances out of which it arose are these. There is in Ireland a register, kept in pursuance of the Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Act of 1891, which is working well, and conferring great benefits on the inhabitants, and it is provided that when a conveyance is registered the registration is conclusive proof of title. Any intending purchaser, therefore, has merely to search the register, and if he does not find the entry of any encumbrances upon the land, he may purchase with complete security, or, if he does find an encumberance registered, he can be sure that that is the only one by which he can be affected. Under the ordinary law of the Court of Chancery, if a man purchased land knowing at the same time that the person from whom he purchased it had either already sold it to another person or created encumbrances upon it, the land in the hands of the new purchaser would not be free from these charges; but in order that this register should work effectively it was necessary to abolish that doctrine, and this was done by Section 34 of the Act of 1891, the entry on the register being made conclusive evidence of title in the absence of absolute fraud. What happened in several cases was this. The local authority purchased land and paid for it, but unfortunately omitted to register the conveyance. The Irish being a simple people, it thereupon occurred to the vendor that he might do a stroke of business by selling the land a second time. This he did, the purchaser knowing perfectly well that the land had already been disposed of to the local authority. But inasmuch as the statute enacted that the register could not be corrected except in the case of actual fraud, and the vendor could not be held to have been guilty of fraud, owing to the purchaser having had notice of the conveyance to the local authority, it became necessary, if the local authority were to obtain the land for which they had paid, for a way to be made whereby the omission to register might be rectified. The Bill, therefore, provides that where any rural district council shall have omitted to register, pursuant to the provisions of the Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Act, 1891, its ownership of any parcel of land acquired by it under the powers of the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, 1883 to 1906, and it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Court that the registered owner of the lands of which such parcel forms a part had, at or before the time when he was registered as owner, notice of the acquisition of such parcel by the rural district council, or was otherwise in equity bound to give effect thereto, the Court may, upon the application of the rural district council, and after such notices as it may direct, order the register to be rectified by inserting therein the district council as registered owners of such parcel, and amending registration as to acreage or otherwise as may be just and necessary, and upon such terms as to costs as to the Court shall seem just. Before, however, consenting to take charge of this Bill in your Lordships' House, I informed the persons interested in it that in Committee I should move an Amendment to provide that it should only apply to transactions which occurred before 1st March, 1908; for although I admit the necessity for this Bill in order to enable local authorities to get land for which they have paid, I am quite confident that it is not a good precedent.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, after the very clear explanation which the noble and learned Lord has given of this measure, I do not think it is necessary for me to enter into any detail upon it, or to make any comments of my own upon the simplicity of certain persons in Ireland which has rendered the passing of this Bill necessary. I will only say that the Government offered no opposition to the Bill in the House of Commons, and therefore they do not intend to put any obstacle in the way of its passing through this House.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, after the statement made by my noble and learned friend Lord Atkinson I shall not offer any opposition to this Bill. But, none the less, I regard it as a very great misfortune that such a Bill should be submitted to Parliament, and I am quite sure the learned Judge at the head of the administration of the Act of 1891 deeply regrets that Parliament should be invoked in reference to this matter. It is really a serious and dangerous blow at the administration of local registration of title in Ireland. The Act of 1891 was a clear and useful measure, requiring that all transactions in relation to land in Ireland should find their place upon the register, and declaring that any person dealing in land could be satisfied that he was in an invulnerable position if he found no record to the contrary on the register. That got rid of the doctrine of notice, which had been carried to a vast extent in reference to previous Acts and which left no one at all certain as to how he stood. If once you depart from the clear requirement in the Act of 1891 that the register must show all the dealings with land, you introduce great uncertainty. My noble and learned friend Lord Atkinson, who is as familiar as anyone with the administration of this legislation, has given the weight of his high authority to the Bill, but I did not gather that there was any enthusiasm in his mind in reference to it; and I think the Amendment he foreshadowed is wise, as showing that no loophole will be left for any suggestion that this is to be regarded as a general opening to a loose construction of existing legislation. I hope the passing of this Bill, even in its amended form, will not be looked upon in any part of Ireland as evidence that the stringency of the administration of existing Acts of Parliament is viewed at all lightly in either House of Parliament.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 1st *December,* 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Petitions for legislation: From Ilfracombe, and North Medway; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Carmarthen, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MONASTIC AND CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS.

Petition from Deptford, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (MERCANTILE CORPORATIONS AND COMPANIES) BILL [LORDS].

Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT).

Copy presented, of Twelfth Abstract of Labour Statistics of the United Kingdom, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN IMPORT DUTIES, 1908.

Copy presented, of Statement of the Rates of Import Duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Mexico, Argentina, Japan, China, and Persia upon the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (COLONIES).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates, in each year from 1893 to 1907 (Forty-fifth Number) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1877.

Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 27th November, 1908, giving effect to Rules of Court [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH TEACHERS' PENSION RULES, 1879.

Copy presented, of Rules under Section 11 of the National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1879 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 25th November, 1908, declaring that Henry Restall, Explosive Worker, Royal Laboratory, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) ACT, 1907.

Copy presented, of the Public Health (First Series—Unsound Food) Regulations (Scotland), 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) ACT, 1907.

Copy presented, of the Public Health (Foreign Meat) Regulations (Scotland), 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 31, 1908).

Copy presented of Accessions of British Colonies, etc., to the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria. Signed at Sofia, 9th December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of Order No. 7610, dated 25th November, 1908, permitting the landing at Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the s.s. "Minneapolis" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "relative to National Education in Ireland, showing: (1) Number of Roman Catholic National Schools in Ireland, number of Roman Catholic Teachers, principal and assistants, with amount of their Salaries, and number of Roman Catholic Children on the rolls; (2) Number of Non-Catholic National Schools in Ireland, with the average daily attendance, number of Non-Catholic Teachers, principal and assistants, with the amount of their Salaries; (3) Number of Roman Catholic National Schools with an average daily attendance of from 10 to 15, with the Salaries and Emoluments of the Teachers of such Schools; (4) Number of Non-Catholic National Schools in Ireland with an average attendance of from 10 to 15, with the Salaries and Emoluments of the Teachers of such Schools; (5) in how many Roman Catholic National Schools has Rule 127 (*b*) been imposed, and in how many Non-Catholic Schools has Rule 127 (*b*) been imposed; (6) how many Roman Catholic National Schools have been amalgamated since 1900, and how many Non-Catholic National Schools during the same time; (7) how many Roman Catholic Inspectors and how many Non-Catholic Inspectors were in the employment of the National Board in the year 1900; (8) how many Roman Catholic Inspectors and how many Non-Catholic Inspectors are in the service of the Board at the present time; and (9) how many Roman Catholic assistant or temporary Inspectors and how many Non-Catholic assistant or temporary Inspectors are employed by the National Board at present."—(*Mr. John Phillips.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Bill—School Attendance.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether, under the Education Bill, it will be the duty of the local education authority to see that all children attend school at 9 a.m.; and whether children in contracted-out schools will be in the same position as those in provided schools as to competition for scholarships in secondary schools, sharing in services of medical inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Education Bill makes no alteration in the law of school attendance, except in so far as Clause 1 (3) prevents a child being compelled to attend a purely denominational school unless the parent has himself selected that school in preference to sending his child to an undenominational school. In regard to the second paragraph of the Question the Bill places no hindrance in the way of children in the schools referred to being equally eligible with children in other public elementary schools for scholarships in secondary schools, and, so far as scholarships made available by schemes under the Charitable Trusts and Endowed Schools Acts are concerned, such children will necessarily be equally eligible with the children in provided schools. In regard to the concluding paragraph, the Bill provides that the duty of local authorities in the matter of medical inspection of children in public elementary schools shall apply to the denominational schools under the Bill as well as to the provided schools.

Colwyn Bay Pier.

MR. McARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale): To ask the President of the

Board of Trade whether, in view of the recent legal decision that the Colwyn Bay pier is an unauthorised structure free from all Board of Trade obligations and restrictions, it is the intention of the Board to take any action with respect to the said pier.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The judgment of the Court of Appeal in the case to which the hon. Member refers was only given on the 18th instant, and I am not disposed to take any action in the matter until the owner of the pier has had a reasonable time to consider his position. I understand that it is possible that he may seek for Parliamentary sanction in respect of the undertaking next session.

New Scottish Fishery Cruiser.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is now able to state when the new Fishery Board cruiser is likely to be at the disposal of the Fishery Board for Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The new cruiser is expected to be ready by 31st March next.

Lighting of the Coast of Ross-shire.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland in view of the unsatisfactory lighting of the coast on the western mainland of Ross-shire, will he suggest to the Northern Lighthouse Commissioners the expediency of establishing a light on Rhue Rhea or at some other suitable point between Rona Island and Stoer Head light.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The proposals of the Northern Lighthouse Commissioners for the current financial year included provision for a lighthouse and fog-signal on Rhue Rhea, and the Board of Trade have given their statutory sanction to the work.

Blake Estate, County Galway—Case of William Forde.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether anything has been done by the Estates Commissioners to remedy the grievance of William Forde, a tenant on the Blake estate situate at Ballindereen, County Galway; whether they took any steps to ascertain the condition of things in connection with the stripping of that estate and the wrong done Forde excepting through the inspector, who treated the tenant harshly on the occasion; and whether, if the several plots now in the possession of Forde will be surrendered by him, they would give him a holding of land on some other estate where there are grass lands available for distribution.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have inquired fully into Forde's case, and do not consider he has any grievance. He holds a farm of about thirteen acres, comprising six separate plots, and, with a view to rearranging the holdings on the estate, the Commissioners offered to give him a new holding of about thirty-nine acres if he surrendered the six plots. This he at first said he would do, but subsequently refused, and the thirty-nine acres were otherwise allotted. If he informs the Commissioners that he is now willing to surrender the plots in question and to take other land in their stead, the matter will be considered when the Commissioners have land available.

The House of Commons and Foreign Treaties.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): To ask the Prime Minister whether he can give to the House of Commons any rule governing the cases in which the consent of the House should be given to treaties with foreign Powers before they are finally ratified, and especially with regard to those treaties dealing with the accession or cession of territory, and with regard to those which effect either the personal privileges, the *status*, or the property of British subjects, and with regard to those which involve some change in statute law.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The rule is as stated in my Answer to the hon. Member for Donegal South on Thursday last, and in the supplementary Answer to my hon. friend, in which I stated that if a treaty involves any alteration of statute law the assent of Parliament is needed;

but I may add that in the case of any treaty which would require a vote of the House to provide funds to carry it into effect it would, no doubt, be proper that the sum required should be submitted to the House before the treaty was ratified. There is no rule requiring that the other matters referred to in the Question should be brought before the House, nor has it been the practice to do so.

Roscommon Agricultural and Technical Committee.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether the Department has held an inquiry relating to the management of its business by the County Roscommon Agricultural and Technical Committee, and to the conduct of certain officials of that body; whether the inquiry was full, public, and on oath; what the findings were on so much of the matter as was disclosed; and whether it is with his sanction that the person whose conduct was most seriously involved still occupies the same position and receives public money through the Department.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department have held no formal inquiry into the matter apparently referred to in this Question. The allegations which concerned the private conduct of an official of the County Roscommon Agricultural and Technical Instruction Committee were not brought formally before the Department but were brought privately under the notice of the Vice-President, who found, on making personal inquiries in Roscommon, that the matter was the subject of legal proceedings. These were pending at the time, and no further information in the matter has been conveyed to the Department. The official in question is an officer of the Roscommon County Committee, and there has never been any information or evidence which would call for the Department's interference with the discretion of the Committee in the matter.

John Bass's Charity at Birstall.

MR. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton): To ask the hon. Member for the Barnstaple Division, as representing the Charity Commissioners, with reference to John Bass's Charity at Birstall, in the County of Leicestershire, as described on pp. 367–8 of the Report of the year 1839 dealing with the charities in that county, what advantages are now obtained by the inhabitants of the place, or any of them, in regard to the pasturage of cattle, or otherwise, as contemplated in the said charity.

(*Answered by Mr. Soares.*) The last paragraph of the Report referred to shows that the charity had even at that time failed as to part as being void under the Mortmain Act. As to the rest, a right of agistment for six cows, a letter was written to the vicar of the parish in 1862 inquiring whether the right was still exercised, and the Commissioners were informed in reply that it had been taken from the poor for twenty years or more before. The Commissioners have no further information about the charity.

Sleeping Accommodation of Irish Farm Labourers Working in England.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that Irish migratory labourers in numerous instances, having returned to their homes after harvesting in England, have been found suffering from pulmonary consumption, traceable to the sleeping places called Paddy houses, in which Irish farm labourers are permitted to be housed in England; whether he is aware that these houses are dark, unventilated barns, in which the men have to sleep in coarse bags on the floor; and whether the sanitary authority can compel English farmers to give proper sleeping accommodation to their labourers; and, if so, will he see that the law is put in force.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am not in possession of any information to show that pulmonary consumption amongst Irish labourers has been caused in the way suggested. At the same time, I am aware that the temporary accommodation provided for migratory labourers, such as navvies, hop-pickers, strawberry and vegetable pickers, is not unfrequently used for those engaged in harvesting, and that this accommodation is often unsatisfactory, though it is tending to improve. One of the medical inspectors of the Local Government Board is, by my direction, now engaged in investigating the conditions under which migratory labourers are housed. A report which he has already made with regard to hop-pickers has led to action being taken by the local authorities, and I am shortly expecting a further report from him in relation to other branches of the subject, which will, I believe, contain some definite recommendations with regard to the matter.

Unemployed Distress at Southwick-on-Wear.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state, in order to get a share of the £300,000 set apart by the Government for unemployment, whether it is absolutely essential that an area like Southwick-on-Wear, with a population of about 15,000 and a large amount of distress due to unemployment, must set up a distress committee; and, if not, whether the Government contemplate making arrangements to meet the needs of such areas on their putting forward schemes for the unemployed.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) As I have stated in answer to previous Questions, the Parliamentary grant was voted for contributions in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act. Hence, in such a case as that mentioned by my hon. friend, I can only make payments from the grant if a distress committee is set up. I am, however, willing in this instance, on the receipt of some further necessary information, to consider whether a distress committee might not be established.

Hop Industry—Recommendations of the Select Committee.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what steps the Board have taken or propose to take with a view to carry out the recommendations of the Select Committee on the Hop Industry whereby the Board would furnish hop-growers in this country with information in regard to the industry in foreign countries, both as to improved methods of culture and as to the state of foreign markets.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board have this matter under their careful consideration; but it is not possible as yet to make any statement on the subject.

Old-Age Pensions Regulations.

MR. C. H. CORBETT (Sussex, East Grinstead): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a woman whose son under compulsion from the guardians pays her 1s. a week through the relieving officer is by this payment disqualified from receiving an old-age pension.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. In the case put, the woman, as I understand, receives 1s. from the relieving officer and the son repays the amount to the funds of the guardians. In such a case the woman, as I am advised, would be disqualified.

Market House on the Harlech Estate.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners will accede to the wish of the inhabitants of Finea, Westmeath, to have the untenanted market-house on the Harlech estate made available for their common use in future; if not, what are their reasons for refusing; and how do they purpose to deal with that building.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The estate is being sold to the tenants by the owner. The purchase agreements were only lodged in March last, and it will therefore be some time before the Commissioners come to deal with it in its order of priority. No agreement in respect of the market-house has been lodged with the Commissioners.

Use of Bogland on Lord Harlech's Finea Estate.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of local differences of opinion as to the arrangements made by the Estates Commissioners for use of the bog on Lord Harlech's Finea estate, Westmeath, and dissatisfaction with those arrangements as understood, whether he will ascertain and state fully how the Commissioners dealt with that bog on the sale of the estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have made no arrangements in reference to the allotment of the bog on this estate, which is being sold by the owner to the tenants.

Reinstatement of Francis McGuinness on the Tottenham Estate, Co. Leitrim.

MR. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any steps to reinstate Francis McGuinness, of Bundoran, an evicted tenant on the Tottenham estate, Kiltyclogher, County Leitrim; and, if not, will he say why no action has been taken.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are unable to take any action in reference to McGuinness's application regarding the two plots at one time occupied by him on this estate, as they are not holdings to which the Land Law Acts apply.

Sale of the Estate of Fleetwood Rynd, County Kildare.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the estate of Fleetwood Rynd and others in the County Kildare was offered for sale in the Land Judge's Court on the 18th instant, and that various prices were bid for lots of the same by occupiers who hold the said lands on the eleven-months system; whether it was stated that the Land Commission had agreed to advance certain sums towards the purchase amounts; whether the holders of the said lands are all graziers; and whether he will take steps to secure that the moneys of the Land Commission should not be used to purchase farms for the grazier class of holders at a time when land is needed for the settlement of cultivators, evicted tenants, and migrants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that this estate was offered for sale by public auction in the Land Judge's Court on the 18th instant. Only one lot was sold, and the names of the bidders for the other lots are not known. Four of the lots had been the subject of proceedings under Section 40 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896. In pursuance of orders made by the Land Judge under that section, the Land Commission some time ago communicated to the tenants offers for the sale to them of their holdings, the purchase money to consist partly of cash and partly of advances to be made by the Land Commission. These offers were not accepted, and were only mentioned at the auction to show the inadequacy of the prices then bid. The lands in question are held on Court lettings for seven years, and are mainly used for grazing. As there is no present intention of making an advance for the purchase of these holdings the concluding paragraph of the Question does not appear to call for a reply.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Royal Naval Engineer Officers.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the question of the *status* of the present Royal Naval engineer officers has been brought before the consideration of their Lordships, as promised by the late Secretary to the Admiralty; if so, whether any decision has yet been arrived at as to the granting of military rank and departmental control asked for to the officers referred to; and, if not, what is the present position of the matter.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The Admiralty are giving the question of the *status* of the present engineer officers due attention. It has been decided to take no action for the present. My hon. friend will agree with me that the question is one of considerable complication.

MR. BRAMSDON: Was not a promise given by the late Secretary to the Admiralty as far back as March last?

MR. MCKENNA: I will look into that.

MR. BRAMSDON: When is a settlement likely to be arrived at?

MR. MCKENNA: I cannot name a date. The matter is a very difficult one, and the Admiralty have decided to take no action for the present.

Admiralty Contracts with Foreign Firms.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what recovery the Admiralty have in the event of a foreign firm with whom a contract for timber is entered into failing to ship their contract.

MR. MCKENNA: Failure to ship would only involve a question of recovery if purchase in default had to be made when the market was less favourable. If a loss occurred, the Admiralty would have to consider on the merits of the case whether or not to pursue its legal remedy.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: What remedy is there as against a foreign firm?

MR. MCKENNA: Precisely the same as in the case of a home firm—recovery by due process of law.

H.M.S. "Gladiator."

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what is the reserve price at which the "Gladiator" is to be sold; what has been the total cost of salving her, including maintenance and patching up to probable date of sale; and whether she will occupy a dock up to the date of sale or be berthed elsewhere.

MR. MCKENNA: It would obviously be undesirable to publish a reserve price for any ship put up for sale. It is not possible at the present time to give the total cost of salving the "Gladiator." She will probably occupy a dock until the middle of December, and will then be berthed elsewhere.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.) asked whether any undertaking would be given that the vessel should be broken up in dock, thereby giving employment to workmen.

MR. MCKENNA: I could not give any undertaking with regard to the course that will be pursued concerning a ship which at the present moment is not up for sale.

H.M.S. "Barfleur."

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many captains have successively been appointed to H.M.S. "Barfleur," and how many crews have successively manned this battleship in the period 1st March, 1907, to 1st September, 1908, or an interval of eighteen months.

MR. MCKENNA: The "Barfleur" became a special service vessel on 5th March, 1907. There were four changes of captains. As the divisional ship, Captain Hoskyns was appointed to her in command of the special service ships at Portsmouth. Captain Hoskyns retired from the service on 15th September, 1907, and was temporarily succeeded by Captain Tothill until the appointment of Captain Grant on 1st October, 1907. Captain Hibbert succeeded Captain Grant on 1st June, 1908. The crew of the "Barfleur" was transferred on 5th March, 1907, and since that date she has been manned by a special service crew of about seventy men.

MR. BELLAIRS: Am I to understand that since the first captain was appointed eighteen months ago there has been only one crew, and that it has never been changed?

MR. MCKENNA: No, Sir; I think I stated clearly that the ship became a special service vessel in March, 1907. The crew in her on that date was paid off, and a special service crew of seventy men was shipped. That crew still remains on her

Isle of Wight Coastguard.

MR. GODFREY BARING (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that

His Majesty's coastguard at Foreland, Bembridge, Isle of Wight, assist in the saving of life from shipwreck by watching the coast for wrecks, by assisting to launch the lifeboat, and by furnishing part of the crew of the lifeboat; whether His Majesty's coastguard at this place have actually performed valuable service in the saving of life on several occasions in recent years; and whether an order has been issued by the Admiralty to close this station immediately.

MR. McKENNA: The answer to the first two parts of the Question is in the affirmative. The detachment, at which there are three men, is being closed to-day, but three coastguards will continue to reside at Foreland for duty at Culver Cliff signal-station.

MR. GODFREY BARING: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in March last the Secretary to the Admiralty gave an undertaking that no further coastguard station should be closed without the House having an opportunity of considering the matter?

MR. McKENNA: I will look up that point. I no not remember the precise words used, but I would remind the hon. Member that in this case the three coastguardsmen will remain in the same place.

MR. GODFREY BARING: Will they continue to perform the life-saving duties they have hitherto done?

MR. McKENNA: Yes, if they choose to volunteer for them.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) was understood to ask who would perform the duty of watching the coast.

MR. McKENNA: That is to be undertaken in future by the Customs Service.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): How can three men man a lifeboat?

MR. McKENNA: There never were at the station more than three men at a time. They were at liberty to volunteer in assisting to man the lifeboat, and they will continue to be at liberty in the future. There has been no change in that respect.

MR. SOARES: And until the duty of watching the coast is taken over by the Customs will the coastguard do it?

MR. McKENNA: The same duties will be performed by the three men at Culver Cliff station as were performed by the coastguard at Foreland.

Government Proposals for Indian Reforms.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that the Secretary of State for India will make a statement in the House of Lords, on or about 14th December, regarding Indian reforms, he will give this House a portion of a day after the above statement has been made in order that this House may discharge its duty in this grave crisis of the history of our Indian Empire.

The following Questions were answered at the same time—

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): To ask the Prime Minister whether facilities will be afforded for the discussion of Indian reforms during this session.

MR. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket): To ask the Prime Minister whether, in justice to this House, he will afford an opportunity to consider the proposals regarding reform in India during this session.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): To ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the interest aroused by the existing condition of affairs in India, he will allow a statement to be made at the earliest practicable date to this House as to the remedial measures which are contemplated by the Government of India.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I understand that in consequence of the necessity of preliminary communication to the Government of India, my noble friend will not be able to make his statement before the 14th. As soon as the statement is made, Papers giving full information in regard to the matters concerned will be presented and circulated to Members of both Houses. These Papers, which, as I understand, are considerable, will deserve and will doubtless receive from Members interested in India, careful and deliberate examination. A short Bill will be needed, but it will probably not be introduced during the present session. I quite agree with my hon. friends as to the necessity of this House being put in possession at the earliest possible moment of the fullest information, as in fact it will be, by the immediate presentation of the Papers; but in all the circumstances, it appears to me that discussion may be advantageously postponed until there has been time for full consideration of the Papers, and until the Bill comes before us, as I hope it may in the early part of next session.

MR. MACKARNESS: May I ask whether there is any precedent for a statement of the gravity of that which is to be made by the Secretary of State being made elsewhere than in this House, without a simultaneous statement being made at the same time to the House of Commons?

MR. ASQUITH: I should not like to say at the moment whether there is any precedent, but I think it is natural for the Minister in charge of the Department to make a statement in whatever House he happens to sit in. But whatever inconvenience might otherwise be caused will, I think, be obviated by the circulation of the Papers, giving the fullest possible information.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the Bill be introduced in the other House or in this House?

MR. ASQUITH: I will not give any definite pledge as regards that. It will not be proceeded with till next session.

DR. RUTHERFORD: May I ask whether the East India Loan Bill will be introduced this session, and whether we shall then have an opportunity of discussing the Papers?

MR. ASQUITH: It is on the Paper. I do not know whether, or how far, these matters will be relevant to the discussion of that Bill.

MR. MACKARNESS: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether his Answer means that there will be no opportunity during this session for the discussion of the Papers in this House?

MR. ASQUITH: So far as I can at present foresee, I do not think there will, nor do I think that it is at present in the public interest that there should be.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): May I ask whether the last reply of the Prime Minister means that this House is less capable of discussing Indian affairs than the other House?

MR. ASQUITH: I am sure the hon. Gentleman knows I do not mean that. On the contrary, I think this House is a proper and natural place for the discussion of all affairs. I can assure the hon. Gentleman—and I think the House will agree with me—that I am most jealous that this House should not be in a prejudicial position as compared with the other branch of the Legislature in regard to this or any other question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Then translate that into action.

Outrages in India.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding the attempt to assassinate Mr. Hume, public prosecutor, on the Eastern Bengal Railway, and the murder of Mr. Clough, district superintendent of police at Lyallpur.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): A bomb was thrown at a train, in which Mr. Hume is stated to have been travelling, on the evening of 24th November. No damage was done. There is no clue to the perpetrator of the outrage. The Government of India reported that Mr. Clough's murder by a police sowar was an act of private revenge and in no way due to political motives.

Malarial Fever in India.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether malarial fever prevails to an abnormal extent in Upper India and parts of Bengal and Bombay; and, if so, whether special steps are being taken by the Government of India to combat this exceptionally severe epidemic.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Malarial fever has been exceptionally prevalent in the United Provinces and the Punjab, and to a less extent in Bombay, and has affected both the European and Indian population. The epidemic began in October last and a telegram received this morning reports it to be rapidly declining. To combat the disease quinine has been largely distributed free of charge, travelling dispensaries have been established, and in places much attention has been paid to the destruction of mosquitoes. The causation of the disease is under investigation by a specially trained medical staff.

Circulation of Seditious Literature in India.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secreary of State for India whether he is aware that seditious literature habitually reaches India from France, whence prohibited newspapers and pamphlets are sent to French-Indian settlements, from which they are secretly distributed in British India; and whether, in view of the friendly entente between Great Britain and France, and of the fact that Bengal anarchists have committed crimes in French possessions also in India, he will consider the propriety of approaching the French Government in view of getting this stream of sedition stemmed.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has the subject under consideration.

House Accommodation in Calcutta.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Secretary of State will inquire into the accommodation available in Calcutta for officers whose duty requires them to provide themselves with such accommodation during the period which the Government of India spends at that city; and, if accommodation is not available at prices such as officers can afford to pay, whether he will take any, and, if so, what, steps to provide such accommodation.

Mr. BUCHANAN: An inquiry was recently instituted by the Government of India into the question of house accommodation for Government officers stationed at Calcutta. As a result of that inquiry, the Government of India recommended, and the Secretary of State sanctioned, two years ago, a scheme for building quarters and for extending the grants made of house-rent allowances. He has received no information from the Government of India leading him to suppose that any further inquiry is necessary at present.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: Can the hon. Gentleman say for what period of the year is the Government of India stationed at Calcutta?

Mr. BUCHANAN: From the middle of the autumn to the beginning of the following year.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: Four months.

*Mr. REES: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that during those four months the expense of living at Calcutta is so great that officers otherwise desirable are sometimes unable to accept appointments of this character?

Mr. BUCHANAN: No doubt the expense of living at Calcutta is very heavy.

Famine in the United Provinces of India.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the failure of crops in 1907 in the United Provinces resulted in widespread application therein of the Prevention of Famine Code; whether the death rate during the period of scarcity rose far higher than in ordinary years; whether epidemic disease prevailed to the same extent as during former periods of scarcity and crop failure; and whether many deaths occurred that can rightly be attributed to starvation.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. The death rate was very slightly in excess fo that for the preceding three years, namely, 36·47, as compared with 35·95 in the lowest of these years. Cholera and other epidemic diseases were, as in similar seasons of scarcity, more than usually prevalent. Much greater care was taken in regard to medical and sanitary administration. Children and infants came with their parents to the works, and were there carefully fed. Emaciated persons were medically treated and only eleven deaths were attributable to want of food. The Secretary of State proposes shortly to lay on the Table the Report of the Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE asked whether the hon. Gentleman would recommend to the Government that similar steps should be taken at home.

Mr. BUCHANAN: That is rather outside my province, but I think that the Government of India have shown a good example.

*Mr. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): Will these Reports be confined to the United Provinces, or will they deal with other parts of India? My hon. friend informed me recently that the whole question was under consideration.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The most important and interesting Report is that of the Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces.

British Vice-Consuls in the Congo State.

*Sir CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can inform the House if any steps have been taken towards increasing the number of British Vice-Consuls in the Congo State; and if His Majesty's Consular staff can be provided with means of conveyance on the Upper Congo and its affluents.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): I am taking measures to constitute the Vice-Consulate in the Katango district a permanent instead of a temporary post; to create a new Vice-Consular post in the Kasal district; and to provide a steamer on the Upper Congo to assist His Majesty's Consular officers in their official tours.

Gun Running into Afghanistan.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, last month, Afghan gun-runners, smuggling arms from Persia into Afghanistan, surrendered to a band of Persian robbers who, in turn, surrendered to the Nushki Bey; and whether the Persian Government is taking steps to prevent a practice fraught with such danger to British troops and British interests in India.

Sir EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Government have received no report on the incident referred to in the first part of the Question. In regard to the second part of the Question, I can add nothing to the Reply given to the hon. Member on the 14th ultimo on this subject, to the effect that His Majesty's Government did not fail to keep the importance of the question before the Persian authorities and that the latter were doing what they could to deal with it.

Pension Claimants.

Mr. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that certain newspapers are publishing lists of persons whose claims to pensions have been admitted under the Old-Age Pensions Act and whether he will communicate with the pension officers with a view to stopping the practice.

The TREASURER of the HOUSEHOLD (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.; for Mr. Lloyd-George): I may refer my hon. friend to the reply which my right hon. friend gave to a Question on this subject by the hon. Member for the Barnard Castle Division on the 19th ultimo. My right hon. friend has no reason to suppose that information in these cases has been given by pension officers, who have instructions to treat the names both of claimants and of pensioners as confidential. In cases in which the names of pensioners have been communicated to the Press, he believes the communication has been made through the local pension committee, who are free under the Act and Regulations to exercise their own discretion in the matter. He has already expressed the view that this practice is for many reasons undesirable, and hopes that pension committees will as a rule treat all applications as confidential.

Mine Timber.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the statement of Mr. Henry Hall, inspector of mines, to the effect that Welsh larch is less liable to spontaneous combustion than foreign timber; and whether any and, if so, what steps have been taken to bring this information to the knowledge of those engaged in coal mining.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have seen the Paper to which my hon. friend refers. The experiments made upon the inflammability of various sorts of wood are interesting, but not on a scale extensive enough to warrant the conclusion suggested in the Question. The Paper has been published by the Institution of Mining Engineers, and will no doubt come to the notice of those engaged in the industry in the ordinary course.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): Is there any instance in which spontaneous combustion has been traced to the use of foreign timber: and would the supply of Welsh larch be in any degree adequate to the demand for the Welsh collieries alone?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not prepared to go into that.

*MR. REES: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of holding a more extensive investigation into this subject in view of the importance of the matter to the Welsh counties?

MR. GLADSTONE'S reply was inaudible.

White Phosphorus.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many manufacturers in this country employ white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches; and how many cases of necrosis there have been in each such factory in each of the last five years.

MR. GLADSTONE: There are ten firms using white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches. One firm has had five cases of necrosis during the last five years; the other firms have had none. This result has only been attained by means of an elaborate and costly system of regulation. Moreover, as intimated in the Memorandum prefixed to the Bill now before the House, recent events have shown that the existing regulations are insufficient to remove entirely the risk of necrosis, and that even more stringent regulations would be required if the use of white phosphorus were to be continued.

Dove Petty Sessions—Alleged Parental Neglect.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the sentence of three months' hard labour passed at the Dove Petty Sessions, in Herefordshire, upon one Barber for the neglect of his five children; whether he is aware that the case was put forward by a man employed and paid by private persons to promote such prosecutions, that Barber was at work seventy hours a week on a wage of 20s., had recently lost his wife, and was by various circumstances prevented from doing more for his children; and whether, seeing that the evidence showed that the children were well fed and healthy, he will say what steps he intends to take in the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am making inquiry with regard to this case, and I will let the hon. Member know the result.

Building Accidents in Oxford Street.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): I beg to ask the

Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state how many fatal and non-fatal accidents have happened on the premises now in course of construction in Oxford Street, W.C., by the Waring-White Building Company, from the commencement of the work to the present time.

MR. GLADSTONE: During the period mentioned, a little over eighteen months in length, three fatal and forty-five non-fatal accidents have been reported. All the fatal and most of the non-fatal accidents were due either to the worker falling or to his being struck by something falling. As the hon. Member is aware, a Bill is now before the House to enable me to make regulations for the prevention of accidents in building operations.

Commission on Meat Trusts.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state how often the Committee on Meat Trusts has met up to this date; and when he expects to receive the Report.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): I am informed that the Departmental Committee on Combinations in the Meat Trade has held eleven meetings for the taking of evidence. I understand that it is not possible at present to state when the Committee's Report will be received.

Case of Gertrude Andrews.

MR. BELLOC: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the complaint of Gertrude Andrews that her hair was cut off in a remand home; whether he has any official information on the subject; and, if so, what steps he will take.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to refer him to the answer which I gave to the similar Question put to me on Tuesday last by the hon. Member for Bethnal Green. I will send him a copy of that Answer.

Old-Age Pensions Regulations.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, in regard to the granting of old-age pensions, if he can state whether a woman whose husband is in receipt of relief would be rendered ineligible for a pension simply because she benefits by the relief, or whether the husband would be regarded as the sole person in receipt of relief.

MR. JOHN BURNS: If the relief given to the husband was given wholly or partly for or on account of the wife she would be ineligible for a pension.

MR. BLACK (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if a married woman, who has hitherto maintained herself by her own labour, would be debarred from a pension if her husband had been in receipt of parish relief to the extent of 3s. per week; and whether a woman in these circumstances is held to participate in the poor relief which is granted to her husband.

MR. JOHN BURNS: If the relief was given to the husband solely for his own support it would not disqualify the wife, but if it was given to him wholly or partly for the support of his wife she would be disqualified.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the officials at Somerset House put a contrary interpretation upon this?

MR. JOHN BURNS: That may be, but I think it safe for me to give the House the opinions supplied by the Law Officers of the Crown after mature consideration.

MR. ROGERS: Does the right hon. Gentleman realise the extraordinary difficulty in which pension committees are placed when the Commissioners give one interpretation and the Local Government Board another?

MR. JOHN BURNS said he would consult with the Chancellor of the Exchequer to see whether members of the pension committees could not be supplied with a short Memorandum embodying the definitions that had been given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and himself.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Could the relief given to a husband when living with his wife be treated as relief given to the husband alone, or would this decision only apply where the man and woman lived apart?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: It depends wholly on the circumstances of each case. My noble friend will excuse me if I decline to go beyond the Answer I have given.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): Will the right hon. Gentleman supply the information in the form of a Return to Parliament?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Yes, Sir.

Mitcham Common Improvement.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is prepared to make a grant from the central fund to the Croydon Distress Committee in respect of the scheme of improvements on Mitcham Common.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I have been in communication with the Croydon Distress Committee on this subject, and as a result of representations from them I have decided to make a payment of £200 out of the Parliamentary grant towards the work on Mitcham Common.

Mr. DOBSON (Plymouth): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the guardians might be more effectually helped in dealing with the distress if he gave assistance for the widening of Addiscombe Road rather than for the improvement of Mitcham Common?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Yes; and I have shown my sympathy to the extent of granting £1,000 for that work.

Lynn Corporation Farm.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has caused inquiry to be made into the proposal of the King's Lynn Town Council to sell the corporation farm of 763 acres at Snettisham; and whether, before reaching a decision, he will consider the advisability of the land being retained, especially in view of the demand for agricultural land under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1907.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I have caused inquiry to be made on this subject, and the question whether the land should be retained or sold is now under my consideration. I may say, however, that I am advised that the land is not suited for the purpose of small holdings.

City of London Auxiliary Postmen.

Mr. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, although the auxiliary postmen employed on the last delivery in the City of London signed in July last a notification of their increase of pay of 9d. per week, they have not yet received this increase; and whether he will give instructions that these men be paid the increase they are entitled to.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Town Hamlets, Poplar): The amounts were paid in full last week.

Supply of Baskets for the Post Office.

Mr. WATT: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what was the sum spent on baskets for his Department for use in Scotland; and how much of that sum was placed with Scottish firms with their places of business in Scotland.

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The number of baskets required specifically for use in Scotland is very small, only 100 have been asked for this year; and these can be supplied from the general stock. For the general order no tenders were received from any firm in Scotland. Three charitable institutions in Scotland tendered, and I hope I may be able to give an order for trays to one of them.

Single-Room Schools and the Right of Entry.

Mr. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, under Clause 2 of the Elementary Education Bill, it is intended to provide for the right of entry in single-room schools in the country districts.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Yes, Sir, if it is administratively practicable. I do not think it is possible to lay down a hard and fast rule, applicable to all single-room schools; but large numbers of these schools are already provided with partitions, screens or other means of separating classes, or are otherwise suitable for the conduct of two or more classes.

MR. ASHLEY: How is the right of entry to be effected in such cases?

MR. TREVELYAN asked for notice.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease in America.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he will state from what source he has received information as to foot-and-mouth disease existing in America; when did the outbreak occur and when was he advised of it; what area is the disease confined to, and will he state the extent of the area affected by the prohibition; are the precautions taken against this disease with regard to America similar to those applied in Great Britain and Ireland; and are any special precautions being taken against the landing of Canadian cattle in view of the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in America.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The first intimation of the existence of disease in the United States came from the British Consul at Philadelphia, whose cable was received by the Board on the 16th ultimo. Details as to the original outbreak are not yet available, but a full Report is expected shortly from the Ambassador at Washington. The existence of the disease has been confirmed by the federal authorities in the States of Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan and Maryland, and the exportation of cattle from these States and also from the States of New Jersey and Delaware is prohibited. The regulations of the United States of America normally require imported cattle—except those for immediate slaughter—to be quarantined for sixty days if imported from the United Kingdom, for ninety days if imported from any other country. As regards Canada, however, less stringent requirements obtain. These precautions are not, of course, similar to those in force in Great Britain and Ireland, as the regulations of the former only admit cattle from non-prohibited countries for slaughter at the port of landing, whilst there is no trade in foreign cattle to Ireland. The Board have not themselves adopted any additional precautions against the landing from Canada of cattle for slaughter, as the Dominion Government have taken the most stringent measures to safeguard their herds from the introduction of disease from the United States and have also prohibited the export of their cattle from ports in the United States and the use of their ports by cattle vessels which have been in such ports.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Will the hon. Gentleman give us an assurance that cattle from the infected ports in America are not shipped to this country *via* Boston?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: We are satisfied with the precautions which are being taken.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, which of the States of the United States are prohibited from sending cattle to this country.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware, so far as our orders are concerned. The Regulations of the Federal Government, under which no cattle are allowed to be exported from States declared to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease, apply also to Michigan.

Cattle Imports.

MR. COOPER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somersetshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will give the number of cattle landed at Deptford and Birkenhead cattle markets for immediate slaughter, for the weeks ending 18th and 25th November; whether these cattle were imported from Canada or the United States; whether, as cattle are allowed to be imported from the States of the United States which have no cattle disease, he will allow the importation of cattle for immediate slaughter from European countries officially declared free from cattle disease; and, if not, will he state his reason.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The number of cattle landed at Deptford, for the weeks ending 18th and 25th November, from the United States ports was 2,227 and 2,028, and from Canadian ports, 2,939 and 1,256, respectively. The number landed at Birkenhead during the same periods from the United States ports was 1,225 and 3,264, and from Canadian ports 1,169 and 1,236. The Board's action in maintaining the prohibition of importation of animals from Europe is based on the considerations indicated in Section 25 of the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894, under which questions other than that of the sanitary conditions of animals must be taken into account.

MR. WATT: Why does the Department discriminate between States in America and not in Europe?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Because in America the States are under one Central Government. In Europe they are under separate Governments.

MR. COOPER: Why not allow importation from the Argentine?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: For the very good reason we are not satisfied that the precautions taken there are adequate.

Small Holdings—Defaulting Councils.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, seeing that the Small Holdings Act came into operation on 1st January last in all counties alike, and while working beneficially in some counties is being nullified in others, whether the Board has due regard to the hardship inflicted on the people in the latter counties whom the Act was intended to benefit; whether he will lay upon the Table the latest communication addressed by the Board to the defaulting councils on the subject of their default; and whether the Board will forthwith address a mandatory communication to defaulting councils in whose counties there is a demand for small holdings, or would be a demand if land were acquired, and fix 31st December, 1908, as the latest date before which those councils must take action *bona fide* for the purposes of the Act.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board do not think any useful purpose would be served at present by adopting the hon. Member's suggestions.

Small Holdings in Hampshire.

MR. R. HARCOURT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somersetshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Hampshire County Council have furnished any report as to the applications for small holdings, amounting to some 5,000 acres, refused by them; and, if not, whether it is proposed to call for one.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The reply is in the negative. We do not propose to ask for the reasons for rejection unless we are appealed to by the applicants themselves.

*MR. R. HARCOURT: Do I understand that the Board do not propose to take the initiative in informing unsuccessful applicants that they have a power of appeal?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said the Board naturally did not inform every applicant of the rejection of their applications by the county council, because they were not aware of the rejection unless there was an appeal to the Board.

MR. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton) inquired whether the hon. Gentleman had received any complaints.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Certainly, there have been complaints received from different parts of the country. Those complaints are always strictly investigated.

Second Division Clerks—New Salary Scale.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the issue of the Order in Council, dated 21st December, 1907, providing a new scale of salary for second division clerks, is to be construed to be an acquiescence on the part of the Treasury in the view that the old scale of pay was inadequate for the maintenance of a second division *status* in the earlier years of service.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The Answer is in the negative. I would refer the noble Lord to the answer given yesterday to my hon. friend the Member for Kennington.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: Was this order made for the purpose of increasing the salaries? If not, what was the object?

MR. HOBHOUSE: I have already said the Answer to that Question is in the negative.

Prosecutions for Corruption.

MR. RENTON (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General if he will state how many prosecutions have taken place to date under the Prevention of Corruption Act, and how many convictions have resulted therefrom.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields): Fifteen prosecutions have been authorised under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906. Convictions have been obtained in ten cases, one case was abandoned, and four cases are still pending.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): How many cases were there in which the Law Officers have refused permission to prosecute?

SIR W. ROBSON: I should not like to answer very positively off-hand, but I myself do not know of any. My learned predecessor may perhaps have refused in some cases.

Outdoor Relief in Scotland.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if any instructions have been issued by the Local Government Board to parish councils in Scotland forbidding the payment of outdoor relief up to 5s. per week.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Board have issued no such instructions. The facts are these. The Board have been asked by several parish councils whether, in view of the Old-Age Pensions Act, they would be justified in increasing the aliment of all poor persons above seventy years of age to 5s. per week; and they have answered that parish councils would not be warranted in so raising the allowance, but must be guided solely by the needs of the paupers without reference to the Old-Age Pensions Act.

Glasgow Young Men's Christian Association Classes.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that evening classes have for years been carried on by the Young Men's Christian Association at Glasgow, that these classes have met a felt want of the community there, and that they have earned in grants from £250 to £300 per annum; if so, will he say how this institution is to be dealt with under the Education (Scotland) Bill; and, if no provision has yet been made for it and similar institutions, will he see that such is introduced in another place.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am aware that the classes in question have been carried on as stated, and that they have been in receipt of considerable grants from the Department. Nothing in the Bill deprives the managers of the power or the opportunity to earn these grants in the future as in the past, and there is no occasion for making any special provision regarding this and similar institutions in the Bill.

Poyntzpass Sewerage.

Mr. McKILLOP (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether ratepayers of Poyntzpass, County Armagh, have sent two petitions to the Local Government Board for Ireland praying that a sworn inquiry might be held by them into the defective sewerage of the village; and whether, seeing that both the local sanitary officer and the Local Government inspector have reported upon and condemned the system so far back as 1904, and that there has, in fact, been an outbreak of scarlatina in the district, he will take any steps to secure an inquiry into the matter with a view to a remedy being applied.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): The facts, speaking generally, are as stated in the Question. The representations made to the Local Government Board did not, however, comply with the requirements of Section 15 of the Public Health (Ireland) Act. 1896, and the Board were, therefore, unable to take action on them. The requirements of the section have been explained to the petitioners, who have, however, taken no further action.

Countess of Charlemont's Armagh Estate.

Mr. McKILLOP: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what is the present position of the negotiations with regard to the proposed sale of the Countess of Charlemont's estate, County Armagh; whether any application has been made by the tenants to the Estates Commissioners for inspection; whether pressure has been brought to bear on the tenants to enter on agreements which they consider unfair; whether a memorial on behalf of the tenants was presented to the Estates Commissioners, and whether any reply was made to it; and what action, if any, the Estates Commissioners proposed to take to safeguard the interests of the tenants affected.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have referred the papers relative to this estate to their inspector. Until he has completed his inspection and made his report, the Commissioners cannot express any opinion as to their future action in the matter.

Irish Land Purchase.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the practice of the Irish Land Commission in cases in which a vendor induces a tenant, as a condition of allowing him to purchase, to give a mortgage at high interest on his holding, and the so-called purchaser breaks down under the double load of annuity and interest and is evicted; do they offer such a person any redress; do they hold the vendor, when in the jurisdiction of Irish Courts, to any extent responsible; and what steps, if any, do they take to prevent such transactions.

Mr. BIRRELL: So far as the Land Commission are aware no case of the kind has ever arisen on the sale of a holding for default. The disposal of the proceeds of such a sale is regulated by statute, and the question of redress cannot therefore arise. If any such transaction were brought to the notice of the Estates Commissioners, prior to the completion of a sale under the Land Purchase Acts, they would fully investigate it and, if unfair dealing were proved, would refuse to sanction the sale.

Chapman Estate, Westmeath.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet had an inspection made of the Chapman Estate, Killna, Westmeath; whether they have ascertained that it comprises uneconomic holdings and evicted land suitable for relieving congestion; whether they are aware that the delay in sale is caused by attempts of the vendor to use up the evicted land by enlarging a demesne already ample and creating new tenancies in favour of graziers; and whether they will allow the intentions of Parliament to be defeated in this manner, or will intervene now in time by intimating their purpose not to declare the lands in question to be an estate unless sold in their entirety to the Commissioners for disposal as the necessities of the estate and district demand.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners will deal with this estate in its order of priority. Its turn will not come for some time, and meanwhile the Commissioners cannot express any opinion as to their future action.

Limerick Labourers' Cottages.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an inquiry has been lately held in Limerick as to the claims made for cottages by the labourers of Singland and Blackboy Pike; and, if so, whether it went to show that a large number of those men were living in houses unfit for human habitation; and what steps, if any, have been taken to remedy such a state of things and to provide cottages and plots for those labourers under the last Labourers Act.

MR. BIRRELL: An inquiry was held in March last into a scheme submitted by the Limerick No. 1 Rural District Council for the erection of 326 cottages of which twenty were to be built in the townland of Singland. None of these twenty cottages were sanctioned by the Local Government Board Inspector as one of the proposed sites was found to be unsuitable, and the other nineteen were marked on 164 acres of untenanted land, on an estate purchased by the Estates Commissioners, which were required for distribution and have since been allotted among twenty-two tenants on the estate. A number of the applicants for these cottages were shown to be living in houses unfit for habitation. It is for the district council to consider whether they will make a new scheme and provide therein for these labourers.

Roscommon Pensions Committee.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an appeal by the pensions officer against the decision of the Roscommon pensions Committee in the case of Thomas Conboy was recently decided by the Local Government Board; whether the Board before giving its decision was aware that the relief extended to applicant was in the nature of provisional or medical relief given by the relieving officer in kind by the order of the medical officer, and that upon further consideration of the case the pensions officer himself declared that this was a case for a pension; and whether, in view of all the circumstances, he will request the Local Government Board to reopen the matter with a view to considering the further evidence obtained in regard to it.

MR. BIRRELL: The repy to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. Before deciding the appeal the Local Government Board satisfied themselves that the relief afforded was not saved by the proviso to Section 3 (1) (*a*) of the Old-Age Pensions Act. This decision is, under the statute, final and conclusive.

Irish Female Schools.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of female schools in Ireland which have been closed because of insufficient attendance; how many of these schools have been constructed under the supervision of the Board of Works' architects; and will he say what public use, if any, it is intended to make of these buildings.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that many female national schools in Ireland have been closed owing to the reason that the attendances required by the National Commissioners' rules cannot be secured, with the result that delicate female children residing in rural districts have, in many cases, to travel six miles daily in going to and returning from other female schools; and, if so, whether, in the interests of the public as well as of the health of the children, he will recommend a modification of the rule governing average attendances in female schools.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that since 1st January last only one girls' school has been closed. This was a non-vested school. During the same period thirty-five schools for girls have been amalgamated with neighbouring schools for boys, so as to form mixed schools. In these cases the old buildings are still available as class-rooms or for other schools purposes. The Commissioners are prepared to investigate any cases of alleged hardship in connection with the closing or amalgamation ot schools if supplied with particulars. Their rules prescribe twenty pupils as the minimum attendance warranting grants. This number may be composed of boys and girls, or of either sex exclusively. An exception is made in cases where religious minorities have not the means of instruction within a reasonable distance of their homes. The Board of Works inform me that no national schools have been built under the supervision of their architects. Where a school is being erected by the aid of a Government grant or loan, the Board's architects occasionally inspect the building to see that the instalments of the grants or loan have been earned, but the responsibility for the work rests with the managers of the school.

Food Analysis in County Cavan.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say whether any samples were submitted to the public analyst under the Food and Drugs Act during the year 1907 from County Cavan, and, if so, how many distinguishing between liquid and solid; and is the work of analysis entirely performed by the public analyst whose signature is appended to the certificates given in evidence in prosecutions under the Food and Drugs Act in County Cavan.

MR. BIRRELL: It appears from the Reports made to the local authority by the public analyst that 680 samples were submitted from County Cavan to the analyst in 1907. The samples consisted of 383 articles of food, of which 176 were solid and 207 liquid, and 297 drugs. I have no information as to the arrangements made by the analyst for the discharge of his duties.

Cashel Disturbances.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Tuesday last, on the occasion of the trial of eight respectable young men at Cashel the police under the command of County Inspector Rogers charged the people in the streets with batons, knocking down men, women, and children, indiscriminately, striking some of them while on the ground, batoned one old woman who tried to protect a man from their violence, and that at night the police paraded the streets of Cashel, burst into several houses, and batoned the inmates; whether the police arrested a number of people who were returning from a dramatic entertainment held in the town hall; and whether County Inspector Rogers is the same police officer who ill-treated the people at the Watergrass Hill, County Cork, evictions, and who subsequently corroborated the version of the explosion at Glenahiery given by Lord Ashtown as against the sworn evidence of Captain Loyd (Home Office expert), the evidence of the local police, and the district inspector who was specially told off to inquire into the Glenahiery explosion.

MR. BIRRELL: On Monday, 23rd November last, at Cashel eight men were returned for trial without bail upon a charge of riot and unlawful assembly at Holycross. After the hearing, a crowd of 600 or 700 persons, which had assembled, attacked the police with stones, severely injuring a district-inspector and two constables and striking others. The stone-throwing continued until the crowd had been dispersed by repeated baton charges. In the evening the rioting was resumed, and a determined attack was made on the police barracks. Further baton charges were necessary to disperse the rioters. I am informed by the county inspector that it is absolutely untrue, so far as his knowledge goes, that women and children were knocked down by the police in the baton-charges, or that either women or children were struck. Several of the offenders were arrested, and are awaiting trial at Assizes. The whole matter will therefore be the subject of judicial investigation. County-Inspector Rogers was in charge of the police in the earlier part of the day, and District Inspector Hardy was in charge in the evening. County Inspector Rogers is the officer who dispersed a mob at Riverstown, County Cork, four years ago, shortly after the Watergrass Hill evictions. His conduct on that occasion was highly commended by the Judge who tried a civil action arising out of the matter. He also gave evidence in connection with the Glenahiery explosion.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): Was the information the right hon. Gentleman has just given supplied by Rogers himself?

MR. BIRRELL: No, it has been supplied in answer to a question of my own which I addressed to the Inspector-General. No doubt Rogers had a concern in making the answer. Who else could give better evidence of what occurred in a transaction in which he had a part?

MR. BELLOC: Has the right hon. Gentleman got information from the popular side as well as from the police side? Are there no witnesses on the popular side?

MR. BIRRELL: Well, really, I am asked a Question relating to a collision between the police and what the hon. Member calls the popular side, and Questions are put to me as to the conduct of the police on that occasion, and I naturally inquire from the police what their conduct was.

MR. BELLOC: Why? Is there really no machinery in this part of Western Europe for finding out both sides to a question? It is amazing — perfectly amazing.

Ely Estate, Wexford.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the purchase agreements with reference to the Ely estate, County Wexford, were lodged with the Estates Commissioners in July, 1906, and that nothing more has since been done; and can he say if there is yet any prospect of the inspection taking place and the sale being carried out.

MR. BIRRELL: The purchase agreements in this case were lodged on the date mentioned and the estate will be dealt with in its turn. Having regard to the large number of estates in respect of which purchase agreements were lodged on earlier dates, the Estates Commissioners are not in a position to say when the estate will be inspected.

Newbawn Evicted Tenant.

MR. FFRENCH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mrs. Ellen Egan, now residing at Newbawn, Wexford, was evicted from her farm of sixty acres on the Leigh estate, Rosegarland, in 1888; whether all the particulars are in the hands of the Estates Commissioners; and if they will take any action to bring about a settlement between her and those in occupation, who would be likely to give up the land for a small sum of money.

MR. BIRRELL: Mrs. Egan's application was not received within the time specified in the Evicted Tenants Act, but will be inquired into when the Leigh Estate is being dealt with under the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Colonel Gascoigne's Tenantry.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that about ten days since in the town of Kilfinane, County Limerick, the bailiff of Colonel Gascoigne served writs for possession on several of his town tenants, there being no rent of any account due, but merely as the result of a request on the part of the tenants to have their rents reduced; did Fenton the bailiff serve those writs with revolver in hand; was he accompanied by members of the constabulary force, and, if so, by whose orders; and will the Executive Government on such occasions utilise the police in the early stages of the proceedings to recover possession of houses from people many of whom are in poverty.

MR. BIRRELL: Proceedings are pending for assaults in connection with this matter, and it is not therefore desirable to make any statement on the subject.

Broughal Evicted Tenant.

Mr. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Estates Commissioners gave notice in the *Gazette* in June last that they intend to acquire compulsorily the farm from which Rody Dooley, Broughal, King's County, was evicted; and will he say when Dooley may hope to be reinstated.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the owner is prepared to accept the price estimated by them for this farm, and they hope that the evicted tenant will be reinstated at an early date.

Government Boards

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the Board of Agriculture has never met; whether the business of that body is left entirely to permanent officials, an unelected body; and whether he could see his way to dissolve the present Board and to reconstruct another, composed of not less than fifteen members and drawn from all parties represented in this House, all of whom shall be unpaid, and whose duties shall be to assist the Minister of Agriculture and who shall meet not less than once per week.

Mr. ASQUITH: It is the fact that this Board has never met. I believe the same thing may be said of the Board of Trade and the Local Government Board.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: And the Treasury Board.

Mr. ASQUITH: No.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: It only meets once a year.

Mr. ASQUITH: The political head of the Department for the time being is responsible to Parliament for all its proceedings. I do not think that the arrangement suggested by the hon. Gentleman would tend to administrative efficiency.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill, with Amendments.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No. 2) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham), in the Chair].

Clause 2:

*Mr. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said he put down his Amendment to leave out subsection (1) at an early stage because it was clear that the only method which one had in the short time at the disposal of the Committee for examining into the value of the concession as to the right of entry would be considerably postponed if the opportunity presented by this course was not taken advantage of. He had never belonged to the number of those who denied that, as far as the right of entry was concerned, a very real and substantial concession had been made by Nonconformists to members of the Church of England. It was clear that if the right of entry was secured in such a manner as to be really a right of effective entry into all the provided schools, a very great concession indeed was made to the Church. From what had fallen from the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education there were grounds for assuming that they intended, at least, that this right of entry should be made effective, but it was a little difficult to understand some of the qualifications which had been made upon this point by prominent Nonconformists. Dr. Clifford had said he was able to support it in so far as it was a definite approach to the ideal; the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett said that no loss of principle was involved, so long as no pressure was brought to bear either on the parents or the teachers; and Dr. Horton had said his own difficulty centred in Section 5 of Clause 2, and that everything turned on the regulations which would be made for determining the effect of the demand of the parents for denominational teaching in provided schools. Those statements appeared to suggest that those gentlemen were placing some reliance upon the regulations which were to be drafted to prevent that full and effective operation of the clause which it was the intention of the Government to see. On superficial examination the clause appeared to be drafted in a manner hardly adapted to give the facilities which the Government said they were anxious to give. If one read subsection (1), one would see it was phrased in a very curious way. It said—

> "Where the parent of any child in attendance at a public elementary school provided by the local education authority desires that child to receive religious instruction of a character different from that which it is open to the local education authority to give, in accordance with subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, the authority shall, for the purpose of enabling that child to receive that instruction, on two mornings in the week in which the school meets, make available any accommodation in the schoolhouse which can reasonably be so made available."

The extent of the undertaking contained in subsection (1) was merely that whatever accommodation could reasonably be made available in the schoolhouse was to be made available, and he thought that in explicitness the clause left a great deal to be desired; and it contained several serious omissions. The system of right of entry, which was a new one, ought to have been worked out in detail, and he thought some alternative provisions such as he had on the Paper would be better adapted to secure the object of the Government. As an illustration, he would mention that Section 7 of the Act of 1902, which settled the relations of voluntary schools and local education authorities—a very analogous subject to the one at present before the Committee—was a detailed clause of the Bill, and occupied eleven days in discussion. This question of the right of entry, which was an extremely difficult one to determine and to define, contained no detailed provisions at all in the Bill. The regulations were the really important part, and in so far as the desire of the parents was dealt with in the regulations, it was, of course, directly relevant to the provisions of the subsection under discussion. Supplementing the words of the subsection by the regulations, he thought he was right in saying that the desire of the parents for special religious instruction had to be indicated six weeks before the school term began; but to anybody who had any experience of a Lancashire school, such a provision was useless. Taking the working classes in an ordinary town, it was inconceivable that in any large number of cases a written demand for a particular form of instruction should be presented six weeks before the term began; and as showing that it was not a reasonable provision he would contrast with it the regulation of the Board of Education distributing the £100,000 building grant provided under the Appropriation Act, in order that council schools might be built in single school-areas. The original Treasury estimate announced that the grant was intended to be distributed in cases where there was a strong desire of the parents for an undenominational school. One would have expected that that strong desire would have had to be indicated in a manner a little clearer than a mere desire, which was not a strong desire, but the Board's regulations in the case of the building grant only required as evidence of the strong desire a parents' petition, and none of these restrictions as to the date on which the petition must be presented. If they could show a strong desire simply by signing a petition when they were dealing with public money, it must be obvious that when they were dealing with the money of the denominationalists themselves it was a provision singularly ill-calculated to elicit the real desires of the parents to make the requisitions contained in the regulations as exacting as in the present Bill. Without going into any detail at all, he ventured to criticise the manner in which this clause providing for the right of entry was drafted. He suggested to the Government that they had made the limitations the most important part of the clause, and the general declaration the least important, instead of making the general declaration the most important, and the qualification of that principle the subordinate part. He thought it was more particularly desirable that in subsection (1) it should be made clear that the instruction to be given within school hours was part of the regular curriculum and discipline of the school, but it did not appear in the present subsection. He ventured to think also that the method of eliciting the wishes of the parents ought to be identical with the method to be adopted for eliciting the wishes of those parents who wished for Cowper-Temple teaching instead of denominational teaching. It would be the clearest possible indication of good faith on the part of the Government in making the right of entry genuine if they were to provide in the clause that the method of ascertaining the wishes of the parent should be the same whether the parent desired Cowper-Temple or denominational teaching. He ventured to say that if that concession was forthcoming nearly every misunderstanding which existed at present about the right of entry would be cleared away. It would be the best possible evidence which could be given of the sincerity of the desire that denominationalists in council schools should obtain facilities for the teaching of their children. He would not be in order in discussing the terms of the alternative proposals which he had put down lower on the Paper, but he would say that he was not in any way wedded to the language in which they were drafted. If it were really the intention of the Government to make these concessions effective—and he gladly acknowledged that, from their utterances and their later correspondence with the Archbishop, it was to be assumed that they did desire that—they would certainly conciliate a great many people who were, at present, dissatisfied with the reality of the concessions by doing as he suggested.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out subsection (1)."—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Where they' stand part of the clause."

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said the Prime Minister had throughout recognised the vast importance of this clause to anybody who approached the question of a settlement from the Church of England point of view, and he had repeatedly assured them that, whilst the Government in drafting these proposals intended they should give a real and effective right of entry, at the same time he was prepared to consider with an open mind any criticisms that might be brought to bear upon the clause and to amend the clause if it was necessary to secure the result which was common to the Government and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, if he might take him as representative of the great body of Church opinion. In those circumstances he hoped that in dealing with the Amendment the Government would be ready to take the House into their confidence at once and to give some general indication of the result of the further consideration which they had given to the matter. He thought that would very much facilitate their discussions and tend to preserve the non-party and sympathetic attitude that on the whole had prevailed. It must be borne in mind that there were fears on the part of those who set a real value on the right of entry. He had some knowledge of those fears, because from the first he had regarded this clause as being intended to give a real right of entry, but he had found many of his friends rather difficult to convince upon that point. What was it that they urged? If he approached a controversial subject he hoped the Committee would see that he was not doing it in a controversial manner, and that if he said what was disagreeable to some hon. Gentlemen it was not with the desire to be disagreeable, but because it was really necessary that they should know what fears they had to meet if they were to come to anything like an agreement. He started with the assumption that if the Bill passed wth anything like general assent the great bulk of educational authorities throughout the country would accept it and endeavour to work it honestly, with a real desire to make it successful. But there were educational authorities in certain parts of the country who had shown such animus and bias in their treatment of the denominational schools that he found it impossible to convince many of his friends that fair treatment could possibly be expected from them. It might be replied that in that case there was the appeal to the Board of Education, and he for one believed and did not hesitate to state that the President of the Board of Education, whose Bill this was, who had promoted and nursed this attempt at a settlement, would do his best to make the settlement really effective; but many people thought that the Board of Education itself had shown in its administrative and some of its judicial functions so distinct a bias, and had adopted so party an attitude—not under the right hon. Gentleman himself, but under his immediate predecessor—that the confidence which they were prepared to place in it, as shown by the treatment of the 1906 Bill by the House of Lords, they no longer had in 1908. It was a most unfortunate thing, but it was a fact which they must recognise, that the Board of Education in 1908 had not the confidence of the present minority in the House in the sense in which it had in 1906. They could not get over what had happened in the interval. That being so, the words of the statute became, for the purposes of those who wished to assure their friends that the right of entry was really secured, of enormous importance, and not merely the words of the statute, but the words of the Regulations issued, or projected, by the Board of Education, as being the authority which would have to watch over the execution of the statute. He would like to say three things in regard to the Regulations which had been already sketched by the Board. He thought it was an unfortunate mistake, which he hoped the Government would rectify, to put in the clause to which his hon. and learned friend had already alluded, that the parent should give notice six weeks before the term began. He was sure that that was not in the least necessary for the purposes of school administration, and it was placing an obstacle in the path of the enjoyment of the right of entry which in many cases was likely to be for a time at least insuperable in regard to a great number of children. He was certain it was not necessary. The first boarding school he went to—if he might give a personal experience—consisted of members of the Unitarian body and of the Church of England in almost equal proportions. It was not necessary for their parents to give notice six weeks beforehand of the kind of instruction they desired their boys to have, any more than later, when he went to Rugby, it was necessary to say six weeks beforehand whether he desired to take natural science or German. He was asked on the first day of the term, and he was certain they could do away with this long notice, and that in itself would be a concession that would be much valued by those who really cared about the right of entry. In the second place, why should it be necessary, when a child passed from one department of the school to another, to give a fresh notice? Surely, provided the notice was given for the child when it entered the school or at any given period, that notice ought to stand in the books of the school authority and ought to apply until it was revoked. There was no necessity for troubling the parent to make a fresh declaration. These were two points arising out of the Regulations, and there was a third. He joined with his hon. and learned friend in deprecating the form attached to the instructions in which the parent was to give notice. He invited the House to consider what this form would convey to the ordinary parent. He got a form in which he had to say that he desired his child to receive special religious instruction of a character different from that which it was open to the local education authority to give in accordance with subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Act of 1870. Even they in that House did not carry subsection (2) of Section 14 of a particular Act in their minds, and that was a jargon which was wholly foreign to their public discussions outside the House. It was the language of the House or the language of lawyers, but it was not the language in which they discussed these questions with their constituents. They did not talk of subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Act of 1870. They sometimes called it Cowper-Templeism, which had become a slang phrase, but more often they spoke simply of denominational or undenominational teaching. Why could not they have a form in which the parent should say: "I desire my child to receive undenominational teaching, or the denominational teaching of such and such a Church"? If the Government would meet them on this point, they would sacrifice nothing which was essential to them, and they would give something which was essential to those who, from the undenominational point of view, wished to find a settlement of this question. These three points arose on the Regulations. There were other points which arose out of the wording of the Bill. In the first place, was there any difference intended in the mind of the Government by the difference of the wording in regard to the time when religious teaching was to be given in Clauses 1 and 2. That point was raised by the hon. Member for Oxford University and had not been dealt with. He understood that the Government meant that the denominational teaching should be given within school hours. From his point of view, as one certainly who was trying his best to promote a compromise, it was essential that it should be given in school hours. He understood that that was the intention of the Government, but he wanted to know clearly before they decided to go on with the clause whether that was their intention. He asked the Government to indicate further their intentions in particular with reference to the Amendment standing in the name of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Kingston. Were they prepared to introduce some further words to secure that it should be the duty of the local education authority to provide suitable accommodation so that the authorities should not be at liberty to raise fictitious obstacles on the ground that accommodation was not easily obtainable? He asked further whether the right hon. Gentleman attached any great importance to the limitation of denominational teaching to two days in the week. He did not himself attach very great importance to that from either point of view, because he could conceive that in most denominational schools, outside those where the whole atmosphere was denominational all the day long, and which therefore would be contracted-out under the Bill, that portion of ther eligious teaching which was not specifically denominational probably now was given on three days out of the five.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): Denominational teaching occupies one morning of the week [Cries of "No, no."]

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said his object really was not to invite controversy on that point. He said frankly that he did not attach very much importance to this matter, because in the ordinary denominational school there must be a foundation of simple Bible teaching on which to build the denominational superstructure. That must occupy a large proportion of time. At the same time there were many people interested in this matter who would find it easier to accept the clause if the Government could see their way to give more latitude. From his Nonconformist standpoint he attached no importance to it at all, but it would be no sacrifice to say that where denominational facilities were required they should be given on as many days as the denominational body could arrange for giving it. If the Government would make that concession, it would be valued at any rate by some who set great store on denominational schools and their denominational teaching. His object was to draw the Prime Minister's attention to certain specific points, and he hoped that the Committee might have from him some general statement as the result of the further consideration he had given to the clause.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) said he acknowledged that the right hon. Gentleman throughout had discussed the Bill as a sympathetic critic of its provisions. It was the desire of the Government to make good to the full the assurance he had given on the Second Reading of the Bill that the right of entry which he regarded as an integral part of the proposed arrangement, should be an effective and not a nugatory right. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he had a perfectly open mind, and if he could show that the language of the clause was inadequate to carry out the real intention of the Government, such criticism would be entitled to receive most respectful consideration. The hon. and learned Gentleman had moved an Amendment for the omission of the subsection, the effect of which, if carried, would be to get rid of the right of entry altogether. That, he took it, was not the intention, but the hon. and learned Gentleman had raised the general question whether or not the Government had in this clause not only given the right of entry, but given it in such a manner that it would be fully enjoyed. He would proceed to deal with the specific criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, all of which were very relevant. In the first place he did not believe that there was any foundation for the apprehensions that if, and when, this Bill became part of the statute law of the land, local authorities would not endeavour loyally to carry it out. Local authorities were often obliged to enforce laws of which they themselves disapproved, but experience showed that when a local authority was entrusted by the Legislature with a public duty, the members of that authority in practice endeavoured, whatever their private prepossessions or prejudices might be, to obey the law. As the right hon. Gentleman had recognised, the Government had provided the right of appeal to the Board of Education, and he really did not think the Minister for Education, whoever he might be, would be likely in any sense to exercise his power in a partisan spirit.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the right hon. Gentleman will allow me, I will make a confession which may not be palatable to all my friends. What I want is to give my friends conclusive proof that it cannot be so exercised.

MR. ASQUITH said that both in regard to the local authority and the Board of Education they were obliged to draw a draft on the future, and the degree of confidence with which that draft was drawn no doubt would vary according to the different quarters of the House in which Members sat. But the real point was this—was this a water-tight clause; in other words did it leave a small margin of discretion or indiscretion, either to the local authority or to the Board of Education, more than the exigencies of drafting would allow? The right hon. Gentleman called attention, first of all, not to the language of the clause itself, but to the language of the draft regulations issued by the Department in order that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen might see clearly the manner in which the clause was to be administered. The right hon. Gentleman took exception to three points. In the first place he referred to the requirements that a parent should made a declaration six weeks in advance. Six weeks was really inserted partly no doubt for reasons of an administrative character, but also largely in the interest of parents themelves. If they waited until the last moment it might be impossible or impracticable for the administrators of the school to make the provisions necessary at the beginning of a school term. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that the Government attached no significance whatever to six weeks. It might be made three weeks or one week. He did not care what the precise period was, but he thought they ought to expect, as a matter of administrative convenience, some notice to be given in order to safeguard the right of entry. Otherwise if these things were left higgledy piggledy at the last moment, it might happen that the accommodation could not be provided. Let it be clear that there was no magic about six weeks. Whatever period of time might be found upon examination to be the one convenient to the parents on the one hand, and to the local authority on the other, the shorter period could be substituted. The right hon. Gentleman next objected to the necessity for repeating this notice when a child was transferred from one department of a school to another. He confessed that that was a matter which had not occupied his attention. He believed that when a child went from one department to another, it often went into an entirely new building, and the object of inserting this requirement arose out of that fact. Of course the Government did not desire to label a child during the whole of his school career with its little denominational character. This was a most innocent provision, and intended merely from the point of view of administration. Lastly, the right hon. Gentleman referred to the words in the application form in which the parent expressed his desire that his child should—

> "Receive special religious instruction of a character different from that which it is open to the local education authority to give in

accordance with subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870."

The right hon. Gentleman thought that imposed too great a burden, and that the words of the application might be put in a simpler form. His right hon. friend put them in out of his scrupulous desire to conform with the conditions of the law, but he was quite prepared to substitute a phrase by which the parent should desire special religious instruction for his child and should define the special denominational teaching he desired. Nothing could be simpler than that, and no one would say that it was imposing a burden on the parents. So much for the regulations. He now came to the language of the clause itself and the criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman. With regard to the hours, everybody agreed that 9 to 9.45 were the hours in which this kind of instruction was now obtainable and the right hours to set apart for the purpose.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): May I point out that the language of Clause 1 and Clause 2 with regard to the hours is quite different and very important?

MR. ASQUITH: It is different, I agree, but I do not think it is important. They are the same hours at any rate— 9 to 9.45. Everbody agrees on the hours.

LORD R. CECIL: Are they school hours?

MR. ASQUITH: 9 a.m. is the hour at which the school assembles, and between 9 and 9.45 religious teaching, whether Cowper-Temple or denominational, is given and intended to be given.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: When is the register marked?

MR. ASQUITH said that the register was not marked till 9.45, but that applied to whatever form of religious teaching the child was receiving. There was no preference given in that respect between the one form and the other. Both stood in precisely the same position.

MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether attendance is compulsory at nine o'clock?

MR. ASQUITH said that if the hon. Gentleman would allow him he would rather go on with his two points in reply to the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The right hon. Gentleman had called attention to an Amendment in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Kingston, and asked whether the Government would make it perfectly clear that the accommodation to be given to the children receiving this special kind of religious instruction should be suitable. They were quite prepared to make line 27 of the clause read: "any suitable accommodation which can reasonably be so made available."

LORD R. CECIL: That makes it worse and worse.

MR. ASQUITH said that they wanted to make it better, but if the noble Lord thought it made it worse they would not insert it. By subsection 2 there was the express provision that—

> "The part of the school house in which the instruction is given shall be properly lighted, warmed and cleaned at the cost of the authority."

These were words which presupposed that the accommodation was suitable for the purpose of instruction to be given. It was intended to provide that the instruction should be given where children could be properly and comfortably taught under the ordinary conditions that prevailed in school life. He did not think that such an extremely suspicious spirit should exist with regard to this matter. He believed these words to be effective, but if better could be suggested let them be suggested. They could not, of course, impose on the local authorities the obligation of putting up a new structure for the purpose of providing for these children, and he did not know that that was what the noble Lord wanted.

LORD R. CECIL: No, no.

MR. ASQUITH said that their meaning was that the local authorities should do their best with the structural facilities they actually possessed, and if additional words were shown to be necessary they would be inserted.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman accept such words as "shall make suitable accommodation unless fresh building would be required for the purpose"? [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] That is the right hon. Gentleman's meaning. Will he consider some words of the kind?

MR. ASQUITH said that the Government were quite prepared to accept any form of words which could be devised to make it perfectly clear that they were only dealing with existing facilities and were going to make the best use of them for the purpose. Lastly, the right hon. Gentleman referred to the number of mornings on which a child was to receive this instruction. He thought that everybody would agree that with the object of making the right of entry real they had provided that every child, and not the school as a whole, was entitled to two mornings. He did not think that they could possibly have gone further to show the *bona fides* with which the right of entry was intended than by making that express provision. As the right hon. Gentleman had truly said, after all, the foundation of religious instruction would be in the future, as it had been in the past, the Bible teaching given throughout all the council schools, and as a matter of practice, as the hon. Member for Nottingham had said a few moments ago, rarely, if ever, on more than two mornings, was superadded to the fundamental elementary religious instruction, the special denominational instruction that the parent required. He did not think that anyone had asked or desired that each child should have the opportunity on more than two mornings in the week of receiving instruction in the special tenets of its parents. He thought that he had said enough to show, what nobody would dispute, that it was their intention to make this an effective and available right of entry, and that they were prepared, both with regard to the regulation and the language of the clause itself, to meet such criticism as the right hon. Gentleman had made, and to secure by adequate safeguards that this right—unpalatable as it was to many of their own supporters and of the local authorities—nobody knew that better than he did—should be freely and effectively exercised.

*DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich) said that his hon. and learned friend the Member for the Walton Division, who had moved the omission of this subsection, regarded the right of entry for denominational teachers into council schools as a real and substantial concession, and on this account, no doubt, he offered it no real and substantial opposition. He, himself, wished as one who strongly objected to the concession to offer to it as real and as substantial opposition as his humble powers allowed. The Prime Minister had rightly said that the right of entry was unpalatable to many on that side of the House. So unpalatable was it to him that with the best will in the world he was unable to swallow it, and the speech of the right hon. Gentleman had not helped to wash it down. He objected altogether to the principle of the right of entry and in that he was in a considerable minority on his own side. His position was not a pleasant one. The way of the consistent, like the way of the transgressor, was hard; and last ditches made very uncomfortable quarters. He knew that, because this was the second he had been in during the present session. He had thought that if he ever found himself in the last ditch against the right of entry in council schools, that ditch would be better lined than appeared to be the case that day. He remembered how during the 1906 education debates the Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty had thundered alternate scorn and denunciation against this proposal. He wished that they had the hon. Gentleman with them now.

MR. ASQUITH: I have done the same myself.

*DR. HAZEL said that be that as it might, there were some on that side of the House who even at this stage were not prepared by swallowing their principles to break the pledges which they had given to their constituents at the last election. Nobody pretended for a moment that the right of entry was educationally good. It was educationally bad. It would irritate the local authorities and disgust the teachers. They were asked to reverse the policy of the Liberal Party on the ground that this was a part of a compromise. They all admired the tact of the President of the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman put this Bill and particularly this proposal before them simply as a piece of political opportunism born of bad logic and good feeling. To cover this pill of right of entry, the right hon. Gentleman supplied them with a certain amount of jam. He wanted to examine the right hon. Gentleman's jam purely in the light of the subsection. The jam was that they on that side of the House had got three principles conceded to them: the public control of rate-aided schools, denominational teaching off the rates, and the teachers relieved from religious tests. He wanted to show that by this subsection of Clause 2 every one of those principles was either actually or potentially violated. Take the first one, public control of rate-aided schools. He failed to find in the Bill any provision which enabled the local authority to object to the right of entry, or to the appointment of any particular denominational teacher who might be approved of by the parents. If the denominationalists said that they had the approval of the parents for this particular teacher, whatever objection the local authority might have to him he could snap his fingers at the local authority and walk in on two days of the week, or as it now appeared from the speech of the Prime Minister on five days a week.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the point the Committee were now discussing was not the clause, but the subsection (1). and the hon. Gentleman was obviously going beyond that in discussing the question of the teacher.

*DR. HAZEL said he was sorry he transgressed, but the next point he raised undoubtedly came under this subsection, and that was the question of whether denominational teaching would be on the rates. The subsection provided that the authority shall—

> "Make available any accommodation in the schoolhouse which can reasonably be so made available."

And he put it to the Committee that under those words rates would still be called upon to supply the denominations with room, light, warming and cleaning in the council schools. The teacher, of course, would be paid for by the denomination. But let them see how it worked out. Suppose they had an assistant teacher who volunteered to give this teaching, earning £2 a week for a week of thirty hours. That worked out at 1s. 4d. an hour. Suppose that teacher was called upon to give denominational teaching for three-quarters of an hour for five days a week, they would get three and three-quarters of an hour at 1s. 4d. an hour or 5s. That would have to be paid by those who demanded the denominational instruction, but there would be provided at these council schools at the expense of the rates, the building and all the paraphernalia connected with it, and he said that if a careful calculation were made it would be found that the cost, beside the teacher, would be as great as, if not greater, than the cost of the actual teaching. Then what became of the relief of the conscience of the passive resister? He was not there to say whether the passive resister was right or wrong; he was only endeavouring to deal with the position as it appeared to him. What the passive resister objected to was rate aid for sectarian teaching; here was a difference of amount, but not of principle, and he said that under this Bill the principle of rate-aid would remain. He was not surprised, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, deprecated too much discussion of principle. He came now to the third point. What about the tests for teachers? Clause 1 had already been passed; it read well, and if it stood by itself it would be admirable, but when taken along with this section he said that although the Government abolished tests in name, in fact they kept them, and even added them where they were not before. He was not going to enlarge upon that, but there was from the teachers unanimous condemnation. They said this clause would result in the subtle imposition of tests where no tests existed before.

Of course, they would be told that the teacher need never volunteer, but he was reminded of the American who said: "A man here does what he likes, and if he does not do it we make him." A teacher might volunteer if he liked, and if he did not, it was not unlikely that in some way or another it might be made unpleasant for him. Another point which arose was who was to keep order during the presence of the external teacher. Would the curate, or whoever was imported from outside, keep order, or would the temporal power be there. Would the man with a stick be there to assist the ecclesiastic? He should imagine that there would be poor order if he was not. If the man with a stick was there who was to pay him? Was the denomination to pay or the local authority? He said that this right of entry was a clerical and not a parental demand. The subsection said it should be given where the parent of any child desired that child to receive special religious instruction, and certain regulations had been set out with a form which it was proposed that the parent who desired that instruction should sign. Suppose the parent signed that form, and asked for instruction for his child in the doctrines of the Church of England, what sort of instruction would be given? Suppose the council school served an area in which there were three churches whose incumbents and parishoners had different views—a High Church, a Low Church, and a Broad Church? Which form of religious instruction would the child get whose parent demanded Church instruction? He suggested that this was a most important practical point, because of the difference between the High Church clergyman's teaching and that of the Low Church clergyman.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was again straying from the point. This did not arise on subsection (1), but on other parts of the clause. This subsection only outlined that different religious instruction might be given, and provided that accommodation should be found for it.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil), on the point of order, was understood to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire and the Prime Mnister had not discussed the whole question of the clause, and whether the Chairman would not apply the same rules of order to other Members of the House that he did to Privy Councillors.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) inquired whether it was not possible for them to say anything with regard to the observations of the Prime Minister, both with regard to the regulations and the time and other points which arose under other parts of the section.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he allowed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Worcester to put certain questions to the Prime Minister, and of course, the Prime Minister to reply to them, because he understood that they had relevancy, and he thought they had relevancy distinctly to this subsection. He had followed the hon. Member very closely, and where he considered his remarks were relevant to the subsection he had not intervened, but this did not appear to him to be relevant.

*DR. HAZEL said, speaking with great respect, he thought he was applying his remarks to line 21, in which it was stated that—

> "Where the parent of any child in attendance at a public elementary school provided by the local education authority desires that child to receive religious instruction of a character different from that which it is open to the local authority to give."

He was endeavouring to discuss the probable character of the instruction, but if the Chairman ruled that he was not entitled to do so, of course, he must pass to something else.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the clause referred to special religious instruction; All that the parent would have to do under this subsection would be to state that he would require some form of special religious instruction, but he did not think that the kind of religious instruction or the character of the teaching arose on line 21.

*DR. HAZEL said he was endeavouring to ascertain what sort of instruction the parent was likely to get if he did ask for it. It appeared that there would be an interesting question as to what was Church of England teaching.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he would reply to the hon. Gentleman in the words of the subsection—

> "Where the parent of any child in attendance at a public elementary school provided by the local education authority desires that child to receive religious instruction of a character different from that which it is open to the local education authority to give in accordance with subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, the authority shall, for the purpose of enabling that child to receive that instruction, make available any accommodation in the schoolhouse which can reasonably be so made available."

That did not raise the question of whether it was in the case of an Anglican, a High Church, or Low Church teacher. It only raised the question of accommodation. The other question could be raised on the clause. It was possible it might be raised on subsection (3), but not here.

LORD R. CECIL, on the point of order, and without wishing to contest what the Chairman had laid down for their guidance, suggested that it had been sometimes the custom of Chairmen of Committees in substance to allow a general discussion on the whole clause on a proposal to omit subsection (1) where there was a general consent on the part of the Committee that that should be done.

*THE CHAIRMAN did not think it would be wise or proper on his part to enter into any such arrangement, because he thought it would lead the Committee on future occasions into very great trouble, and it was not wise to make one rule for discussing a clause in one set of circumstances, and another in another set of circumstances. As far as possible, he thought they ought to keep to the same rule.

*DR. HAZEL said he would obey the Chairman's ruling, and with regret he left the extremely interesting question of what really was the doctrine of the Church of England. But he wanted to say a word or two on the desires of the parent, and the way in which those desires might be carried out under the subsection. He trusted that there would be no relaxation of the regulations in such a way as would enable the *bona fide* desire of the parent to be avoided by people who were interested in getting something else, because it was quite possible that unless the regulations were made stringent, and kept stringent, there might be a good deal of misrepresentation, and parents might ask for special religious instruction without really knowing what they were asking for. That kind of thing took place when petitions were being organised against the Bill of 1906, and many a parent signed the petition against the Bill believing that he was signing a petition against a Bill which would abolish Scripture and religious teaching in the school. He was therefore particularly anxious that the *bona fide* wishes of the parent should be respected, and that the regulations should be such as would express that desire clearly so that what the parent was said to desire should not turn out to be some clerical selection. He remembered that some months ago the battle-cry of "Right of entry and right of parents" was raised by his hon. and learned friend the Member for Walton, and by the Bishop of Manchester, who appeared at that time to have elected themselves, respectively, as Emperor and Pope of Lancashire. It was raised in a manifesto which was issued by them—after the manner of the tailors of Tooley Street—in which they spoke in the name of the parents of Lancashire. The main point of that manifesto was the right of the parent to have his child educated in the denomination that he desired, by teachers of whom he approved. That sounded very well, but he observed that one of the parties to that manifesto, the Bishop of Manchester, this time not in collaboration with his hon. and learned friend, had issued a document, which had been in the hands of most Members of this House, dealing with this Bill. Here he found that one of the right rev. Prelate's objections to this subsection was that the teaching might be given by somebody who was approved by the parent but not approved by the clergyman. The right rev. Prelate pointed out that the denominational instructor must be a person approved by the parent, he might or might not be one of the clergy of the parish, he might be one of the clergy from another parish, and then—awful thought—"he might be some layman antagonistic to the clergyman of the parish."

*The CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member had again gone beyond his ruling. There was a great difference between this subsection and the clause as a whole.

*Dr. HAZEL said he was very sorry so frequently to transgress the ruling of the Chair. This sub-section, which was very wide, included the desire of the parent——

*The CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was not talking about the desire of the parent. He was talking about the teacher and teaching, which did not arise.

Dr. HAZEL said he had no desire to argue with the Chair.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.), on the point of order, said the matter appeared to be one of the most intense importance, and he would ask with great respect whether the object of the subsection was not to say how the parent might describe the religion he desired, and had not his hon. friend been trying to show the difficulty the parent would have in describing the religion which the subsection allowed to be taught? Was he not in order in so doing?

*The CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was dealing with the question of the teacher which he had declared out of order, and now again declared out of order.

*Dr. HAZEL apologised, and in justification of his mistake said he wished to say that one of the manifestations of the desire of the parent would be the approval of the teacher, and it was said in the clause he must approve of the teacher, but he passed on. He would say this, however, that the document to which he had alluded, issued by one of the most prominent champions of the parents' rights, showed that the chief consideration was not the right of the parent, but the privilege of the clergy. He said with all earnestness that those who were anxious to restrict, as far as might be, the area of sectarian influence in the educational system of the country, viewed with the greatest alarm, the provisions of this clause. Particularly ominous was the simile used by an eminent divine, who said the clergy were like hounds in the leash waiting to enter the council schools. That being an episcopal simile, he might be allowed to continue it. He preferred to see the clerical pack hunting over their own country, and not in full cry in the council schools. There was much in this Bill that was good, but he would point out that if they had six eggs in an omelet, and one of them was bad, the whole was tainted. He believed this clause tainted the whole Bill. If he were to support it he would be breaking the pledges upon which he had been elected.

Lord R. CECIL said there was one observation which fell from the Prime Minister with which he was happy to be able to agree. The discussion on this particular Amendment had certain disadvantages, especially when it was desirable to get to the details of the clause which were of infinite importance, and would either make this a real clause or render it absolutely valueless. The right hon. Gentleman had appealed to the Committee not to regard this clause with undue suspicion, but before his official duties had called him away the right hon. Gentleman no doubt heard sufficient of the speech of the hon. Gentleman who followed him to gather the reasons why some regarded this with a suspicious view. Could any occupant of the front bench really suppose that this clause, administered by gentlemen in full agreement with the hon. Member who had just spoken, could possibly be regarded by denominationalists as satisfactory? He himself could not possibly regard any clause as satisfactory unless it was of such a nature that it could not be misused by any authority which did not approve of it. They need not go as far as the speech of the hon. Member to see that, because he had the utterance of a Minister whom he was glad to see in his place. The hon. Member for Richmond recently made a speech in which he dealt with this matter, in which he said—

> "They were asked to give in exchange a very big thing called the right of entry. He did not like it, but let them think this. Was the clergyman a very good teacher; did he really like turning out in the morning, going into the school and teaching, with the eye of the teacher upon him to see whether he was doing it well or badly? No, he thought there would be rather a flourish of ecclesiasticism to begin with."

This, he would remind them, was the language of a Minister of the Crown—

> "But after a bit things would settle down, and the churches would use the money they received for the use of their school buildings to improve their Sunday school teaching, and they would probably leave the elementary schools to be managed by the men who ought to have the control—the teachers appointed and paid by the local authority."

He did not think, if a Minister of the Crown made that assertion about the concession offered by the Prime Minister, a concession which was intended to be a real concession, the right hon. Gentleman could much complain if the denominationalists regarded it with considerable care and scrutiny. He understood that the teaching under this subsection was to be given on perfectly fair and equal conditions, except where those conditions were varied by the language of the clause itself. There was to be no sub-current of discouragement running through the provisions of this clause, except those provisions which were absolutely essential to secure the object which the Government said they had in view in respect to this matter. Approaching the matter from that point of view, he wished to see if it was of such a nature that those who desired to receive this teaching would get it placed at their disposal, quite fairly and frankly, without any discouragement on the part of the authors or those who would have to administer the Bill. That seemed to be a fair test of this clause. What was the purpose of having these regulations for insuring the control of the parents in this form? Was not the effect of regulations of this character to make it difficult for parents who required special instruction to obtain it? Would it not be more fair to say to the parents of the children who came to the schools: "What do you want—Cowper-Temple teaching or denominational teaching?" and let them answer the question without giving any advantage to one as against another? That was exactly what was done in the day industrial schools, where the arrangement worked perfectly. Unless that was done in the case of these schools, there was no security that the object intended by the Government would be carried out. In many cases the parents were not only busy people, but very ignorant people, and would not have brought to their minds the means of obtaining their desire. The result would be that those interested in this matter would go canvassing about, and they would have that state of things which no one desired. This was the most important part of the clause, and therefore he had been a little elaborate upon it. He wished to know, was this religious teaching to be given during the period of compulsory attendance? That was a matter of vital importance. There were other matters to which, however, he would not refer, such as whether the discipline of the school was to be maintained during this hour, and other matters of that sort. He did not pretend that this concession was satisfactory, or a *quid pro quo* for what the Church was giving up, but he certainly wished to know whether it was to be a real concession or a mere paper concession which was not worth the paper on which it was written.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) thought that if hon. Members had suggested three years ago that the Government was going to give a right of entry into the board schools of the country such a suggestion would have been scouted by nearly every supporter of the Government. It was said that the position was now changed, but the mere fact that they were getting something in exchange did not alter the result of what they were giving. The name of Dr. Clifford had been invoked in connection with these proposals. A few weeks ago when these proposals were published in the *Westminster Gazette*, what did Dr. Clifford say in reference to the right of entry? He said that the right of entry was "unspeakably bad" if it were, like Cowper-Temple teaching, left to the option of the people, but it was much worse when, as in the present case, it was coercive of the education authorities. It was with Dr. Clifford that the negotiations were conducted as the representative of Nonconformity, and it was Dr. Clifford who said that the proposal contained in this subsection was much worse than "unspeakably bad." If language had any meaning, how a proposal to which language of this sort could properly be applied could be accepted for any consideration whatever was really more than he could understand. Then in regard to the right of entry the Committee had the further advantage of knowing how its results appeared to the mind of the Prime Minister. In the course of the debate in 1906, the right hon. Gentleman, speaking about the right of entry, said there were three obvious and insuperable objections to it. The first was that the right of entry was not desired; the second was, and this was important, that it would inevitably land them in administrative chaos; and the third was that it would leave them with no security for the genuine religious teaching of the children. The Minister for Education had claimed the other night that he had the Nonconformists of the country at his back. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had the Nonconformists of the country at his back. It was true, the whole of these proceedings having been so sudden and unadvised, that it might be the Nonconformists were a little dazed. They were a little puzzled by, he did not call it the discretion of their leaders, but at all events, their leaders' sudden conversion, which remained unexplained. About the time when the Bill, including this subsection, became law, if it ever did become law, he was really afraid that the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education might have a somewhat rude awakening. They had heard a good deal about negotiations with what he might call priest and presbyter, in regard to this matter, but particularly in relation to the subject-matter of this subsection. The Government had not taken into their counsels those whom the subject-matter of the subsection most vitally concerned. They had not consulted those upon whom the really hard practical work of the administration of education fell. They had not taken into their counsels the education authorities of the country, or the managers of the schools, or the teachers, or even the parents of the children. No one in authority seemed to have put to himself the question, which was really a little important, namely, whether this proposal would really work. He had some knowledge of schools, being in fact, in close touch with some of them, and he had no hesitation in saying that the effect of this subsection would be absolutely fatal to the discipline and order of the school. Whichever alternative they adopted, whether they brought in a person from outside or some other person to give the instruction, or whether they employed the assistant teacher to give it, in either case the effect would be fatal to the discipline and order of the school. Suppose the first alternative was adopted, and they brought in a person from outside, an amateur—he would be unable to maintain order. The other day he was conversing with a clergyman, who informed him that good order was maintained in his Sunday school. He was surprised to hear that statement, because he had always understood that good order was not a characteristic of Sunday schools. He asked how such a result had been brought about. The clergyman replied that he had brought in four or five elementary day school teachers to keep order. If they wanted to avoid pandemonium in the school, they must not bring in the amateur, who could not maintain order. It required years of experience to control a class of London children. To avoid pandemonium in the class they would have to bring in the teachers to keep order. On the other hand, suppose the other alternative were adopted, and the assistant teachers were allowed to volunteer. That would be equally fatal to the discipline and order of the school, because the teachers during school hours would be giving instruction for which the head teacher or headmaster was not responsible, and in respect of which he had no authority. That would be really fatal to the good order and discipline of the school. The Government would never even think of introducing this kind of thing into the secondary schools, and he protested against its being introduced into the people's schools, and against those schools being sacrificed by what the Government mistakenly believed to be a political necessity. As a London Member he of course regarded this question with particular interest from the London point of view. In London the effect of this subsection would be particularly unfortunate. In London he found that the accommodation in provided schools was for 595,000, and in voluntary schools for 120,000 children, in round numbers; that was to say, the number of children in council schools as compared with the number in voluntary schools was as about three to one. The proportion in the council schools of London was very much higher than the proportion which obtained in the council schools of any of those parts of the country which at all compared with London. It was obvious, therefore, that in London the area of disturbance which this subsection would produce would be very much greater than in any other part of the country. Why should there be this disturbance? The parents were satisfied with the religious teaching given in the council schools, and the enormous majority of the clergy were satisfied with it, and it really seemed to him that the Government were almost wantonly breaking the peace which had existed for so long. The Bill had been drawn up to effect a settlement, but the provisions contained in this subsection could not possibly be a settlement; indeed, his hon. friend the Member for North-West Norfolk the other night, in a phrase which was right from his point of view, though somewhat maladroit, said that these proposals were emergency proposals. If they were emergency proposals they could not possibly constitute a real settlement. To call that a settlement which was contained in the subsection they were now discussing was really one of the ironies of this matter. Therefore he appealed to the Committee to reject this subsection because it embodied a proposal which would be fatal to the unity of the national schools. For his part he could not see why the Bethnal Green lad should not have the same feeling of loyalty towards his school as the Rugbeian for Rugby, the Harrovian for Harrow, or the Etonian for Eton. He was in the closest touch with the council schools, and he knew the spirit which prevailed in them, and how the common games, the excursions together, and other incidents of school life had produced a growing sense of unity, responsibility, and *esprit de corps*. He must express the bitter disappointment which he felt that a Liberal Government should try to drive a sword into the very heart of that growing unity by dividing the scholars into groups distinguished by denominational names. For the sake of the children attending the schools he now raised his voice against this subsection, and he proposed to record his vote against it.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he sympathised with the remarks made by his noble friend the Member for Marylebone, and he wished to put a question of a very definite character to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. It had reference to the words of the subsection, which were most perplexing to the lay mind. Among others who had been more or less perplexed by its language was the Bishop of London, as appeared by a letter from him to the newspapers a few days ago. What was the real meaning of "two mornings a week?" One theory of the subsection was that the school was to be open for the purpose of this special religious teaching two mornings a week; and the other theory was that the words meant that such arrangements were to be made as to make it certain that a child would have teaching of a special character on two mornings a week. There seemed to be a very great difference between those two conditions, for the reason that it was provided by the subsection that certain conditions were to be satisfied, and if they were not satisfied the special teaching was not to be given. He expressed no opinion whatever on the question, but it was only just to those who felt anxiety upon it that the right hon. Gentleman should give a clear exposition as to the real meaning and intention of those words. There had been a great feeling of disappointment in the minds of Churchmen that there was inequality between the provisions of Clause 1 and Clause 2. Most persons, when reading the two clauses, thought there was entire equality, and that Churchmen, Wesleyans, and Roman Catholics were placed in exactly the same position in the two cases, but it was quite clear from the regulations that, without any application of any kind, a child would receive in a provided school teaching under the Cowper-Temple clause. But, on the other hand, in Clause 2 it was provided that instruction could only be given when application was made. That was not equality between the two. It was certainly a great disappointment to those who were looking for equality of treatment under this clause to find that, in the case of Clause 1 Cowper-Temple teaching was to be given automatically, while if there was to be special instruction there was delay and possibly some perplexity to simple-minded and half-educated peasants. What was the right hon. Gentleman's proposal as to giving legal effect to those regulations? Were they to be issued as an Order from the Department, or were they to be laid on the Table of the House, in order that Members might have an opportunity of discussing them? The regulations themselves appeared to be somewhat severe and ponderous in character, and he did not think those who drew them had had sufficient regard to the properly migratory habits of artisans in our great towns. They all knew how many removals took place in each Parliamentary borough every year. They were part of the life of the best of artisans, owing to changes of occupation, and they would in each case require a new notice when the child was sent to a new school. There were points in the regulations which required the most careful investigation, and there were others which he hoped the Government would see its way to change before the Bill passed.

*SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) thought the hon. Baronet was in error in saying there was to be inequality between the two classes of schools. He was sure they must all regard the President of the Board of Education with the utmost admiration for the diligence with which he had tried to solve this question, for the skill, dexterity, courtesy and conciliation with which he had laid his case before the House. He had not a word to say against the desire for peace shown by the Government in attempting to bring this Bill before the House, and his natural impulse as a party man was somewhat quickened to support the Government even in matters which were distasteful to himself, because of the transparent desire, the intention almost of the Leader of the Opposition, as evinced the previous day, to wreck this attempt at obtaining a settlement on conciliatory, kindly and generous lines as between the religious sections of the community. If what he had to say was contrary to the Government proposal as embodied in the subsection, he hoped his right hon. friend would fully appreciate the spirit in which he spoke and the sense of duty and the long consideration of the subject and long association with it for many years past which compelled him to dissent most profoundly from the proposal of this subsection. He had the warmest respect and admiration for the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Clifford, and many of those concerned in arriving at the compromise, but he thought these questions were too profound in their bearing on national life to be treated as questions, merely to be settled in the studies or the pulpits of ecclesiastics. He would look to the life of the school, to the life of the children, to the whole meaning and machinery of education, and he would say, if they were to look to these broader issues, the suggestion conveyed in the subsection was one which ought to fill with profound misgiving the minds of many who had worked at the education question all their lives. What was the effect of this clause? They were asked to accept this principle of the right of entry into every school as a means of obtaining religious peace and the removal of all the animosities which had beset the course of education for generations past, and paralysed the moral and intellectual forces of education applied to the child-life of the people, which ought to be set free from this wretched friction of religious animosity and the constant contentions of the sects. If he could believe that this right of entry, and all that went with it, would lead to the removal of the religious difficulty and of the trammels which had paralysed the forces of education in the past, he should say God-speed to the proposal. But every consideration, every fact, every atom of evidence they had had during those years tended in exactly the opposite direction. He remembered no speech on the Education question quite so vividly as the great speech of the Prime Minister in moving the rejection of the leviathan Bill in 1896. On Clause 27 of that Bill he said on this precise proposal, when advanced by the Leader of the Opposition—

> "What evidence is there, I ask, that the parents of the children for whom this religious instruction is provided are dissatisfied? This agitation is a clerical agitation. . . . I do not believe myself parents would be found to avail themselves of this clause, but I can conceive that, under the stimulus of a more or less fanatical propaganda, it may be possible to get together in some of our towns a sufficient number of parents to make the demand. . . . If this clause were carried into effect and worked upon a large scale you would have these children in the future herded, if I may use the word, into separate theological pens, branded and labelled with the names of their particular sects and taught under conditions which must compel them, if they had fairly receptive minds, to attach more importance not to the truths which unite, but to the controversies which divide the religious world."

There they had words of sound sense, knowledge of human nature and knowledge of the character of this controversial teaching which was to be forced into the peaceful atmosphere which they had preserved uncontaminated and uninterfered with for a generation past in the provided schools. The present Bishop of Manchester, whose career he had followed with very great interest, and whose opinions deserved the very careful consideration of those who were dealing with this issue, was for a long time the distinguished Chairman of the Birmingham School Board, on which he had some practical experience of this system of right of entry. He was also the Vicar of Aston Manor, where the same system was introduced into the schools. In 1905 he made at Manchester a remarkable speech directed to this particular proposal. He was advocating of course, as always full and specific, and exclusive denominational teaching in Church schools. But what was the Bishop's experience of the result of the right of entry? He said that—

> "The right of entry was unworkable and unprofitable and certain to bring the religious question in its acutest form into places which the religious question had never yet entered. The Aston Manor school board used to allow different departments of the same school to be hired by different denominations, and what was the result? More than once, as Vicar, he had had Sunday school teachers coming to him with tears in their eyes, telling him that their 'Tommy,' who really was a Church child, had been captured by the Wesleyans or some other denomination, and he had no doubt the Nonconformist minister had his teachers coming to him with the same tale. It required all the tact and discretion they could use to keep the peace under those conditions. If he were a schoolmaster he would on no terms allow such a right of entry. The great thing was to maintain the discipline, tone and spirit which belonged to a school, and that depended largely upon the influence of the head teacher."

Sir Francis Channing.

They had the philosophy of this question in the speech of the Prime Minister in 1896, from which this proposal so widely diverged, and in the speech of the Bishop of Manchester they had practical evidence laid before them by a strong and determined supporter of the Church of England. It seemed to him that this was a very serious matter. From long experience he felt that the two points of view he had attempted to lay before the Committee had immense force and weight. If instead of bringing peace, the spirit of brotherhood, kindly respect and sympathy into the lives of children of different denominations they were stirring up in their small minds the narrow and contemptible prejudices of bitterness and sectarian animosity, it seemed to him that in pandering to the demand of the ecclesiastics to get at the board schools, on any terms and by any means, they were doing a treacherous act to the child-life of this country, and betraying also the noblest institutions ever evolved by the local government of this country. The late Lord Salisbury, some years ago, in addressing the National Society, advised his friends to capture the board schools under the existing law, and then capture them under a better law. While the Leader of the Opposition, in his legislation on this subject in 1902, spared the board schools, and left them free from contamination and free from this war of the sects, it had been reserved for the Liberal Government of 1908, returned with a majority unparalleled in history, and pledged to the hilt to maintain the principles of national education, to hand over the keys of the people's schools to the ecclesiastics with apologies, and to trust the future of education to this war of the sects. When he thought of these questions, and of all the Education Bills of which they had seen a gloomy procession passing through this House, when he realised that each of them had failed by the intricacy and illogical contradiction of its provisions, he could not help thinking that behind all these Bills there had perhaps been some evil genius at the Board of Education whose dictation and intrigues had led not only to the abandonment of Liberal ideals but also to the failure of one proposal after another.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) said that after listening to the eloquent speech of the hon. Baronet who had just sat down, he could not understand why he had accused the Leader of the Opposition of a desire to wreck this Bill. If the speech of any one would have the effect of wrecking the Bill, surely it would be that of the hon. Baronet himself. Personally, he had no desire to wreck the Bill, although he must admit this was a measure which did not find much favour in any particular quarter of the House. They understood it was a compromise. He was surprised to hear the hon. Member for Bethnal Green refer to the twelve years peace which they had all been enjoying in educational matters since 1896. He was under the impression that they had been in a state of religious warfare during that time. He had scarcely ever been to a political meeting without hearing of religious strife. They had been discussing the education question for the last three years in the House, and he was surprised to find on the Ministerial side of the House that they were now beginning to speak of the religious peace which had existed since 1896. From his own experience of educational work in different parts of the country there had been, in his opinion, as much real peace since 1902 in all educational matters as had existed at any period since 1870. He had always maintained that if the Act of 1902 had been permitted to continue in operation for some time to come undisturbed, they would have heard very little indeed of those religious differences to which his hon. friend opposite had referred. Personally he was extremely desirous that they should come to close terms with the Amendments on the Paper, and that no more time should be wasted in making speeches of a Second Reading character. For his part, he regarded the concession given in Clause 2 as one of considerable value to all persons who believed in denominational education. At the same time, he did not believe the framers of the Bill had recognised fully the extreme difficulty as regarded administration and management which were involved in making this concession. The concession ought not to be a matter of indifference to his Roman Catholic friends who had rightly voted for the omission of the contracting-out clause. As a matter of fact, there were many council schools in different parts of the country in which there was a large number of Roman Catholic children who would, by means of this concession, be provided with the opportunity of receiving denominational teaching. He hardly needed to say that this was a concession which ought to be valued by the Anglican Church, and equally by the Jewish community. There were council schools containing a large number of Jewish children. He knew of a school containing nearly 1,000 Jewish children, and in that school there was not a single Jewish teacher. He thought some alterations would be necessary in the detailed arrangements made in the clauses of the Bill, and it was for that reason very desirable if this settlement was to be accepted that they should approach those details as quickly as possible in order to see whether the Amendments on the Paper were likely to receive the assent of the Government. Personally, he should have liked to have seen two words omitted from subsection (1), and an Amendment had been put down to that effect. The clause stated that this instruction should be given on two mornings, but why should it not be given at some other more convenient time? He did not think it was possible to carry out the principle of the right of entry unless more opportunities were afforded for denominational instruction than were suggested by the admission of the denominational teacher on two mornings per week. The hon. Member for Bethnal Green was quite right in pointing out the difficulties of management and administration which would arise in regard to the right of entry. He trusted that when they came to consider those details the Government would show that they were anxious that the right of entry should be made real and effective. It was very important that they should approach as soon as possible the consideration of the Amendments on the Paper in the limited time which had been placed at their disposal for the discussion of this question, and he would not on that account trouble the Committee any longer.

MR. LLEWELYN WILLIAMS (Carmarthen District) said he did not wish to give a silent vote on this subsection, because it was a proposal which went to the very root of the Bill. It required a great deal less courage to get up and denounce this compromise than to fight for it, and it would be very easy for him, as it would be for a good many other hon. Members, to take from his pocket old speeches on the right of entry quite as eloquent as the one to which they had just listened from the hon. Baronet the Member for East Northamptonshire. During the last few days he had been reading the debates which took place in the House two and a half years ago in May, 1906, upon the right of entry, in which debates the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham took part. In replying on that occasion his right hon. friend made a very eloquent and convincing opposition to that proposal and pointed out how it was quite unworkable. He remembered that the Solicitor-General and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board denounced the proposal to give the right of entry to these schools. It was quite easy, therefore, for anyone in the House to taunt hon. Members on that side with inconsistency regarding this matter. It was the cheapest form of controversy. He voted for the Second Reading of this Bill, believing that it embodied the proposals which were essential to a compromise, and the only thing he could say in extenuation of his offence, if it was an offence, was that he had been convinced long ago that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was right in the proposal he made in 1906. He said so last May when they were discussing the Second Reading of the previous Education Bill. He was sorry that in the subsection under discussion the Government persisted in one illiberal exception to the proposal made by the right hon. Gentleman then. In this Bill Cowper-Temple teaching was treated as denominational instruction; it received preferential treatment, and that was unfair. That was why he and his friends on those benches believed, as Liberals and Nonconformists should believe, that the State not only had nothing to do with religion on Sundays, but had no right to teach any form of religion on week days. That was why they were compelled to say that the right of entry to all the schools should be granted to all denominations. It was not a position which Liberals or Nonconformists cared to occupy. The right of entry was a thing which he did not care for himself, especially within school hours, and if the teachers were to be allowed to volunteer to give denominational instruction. He confessed frankly that it was a thing which he denounced at the last election. To-day he and his friends were compelled in fairness and equity to support the Government in this matter. The first reason was that, as they were told, it was a compromise. It was a compromise which entailed sacrifices on the Church of England; they had to give up every school they possessed in the single-school areas. Some compensation should be given in justice and fairness for that. In the second place, Cowper-Temple teaching, which was not only believed in by a majority of Nonconformists, but which was endowed out of public funds, was continued by the Bill. In the face of these two things it was only just and equitable that real compensation should be given to the Church of England for the sacrifices they made. If the right of entry was to be granted to them, they must see that the facilities were real and not sham. If the words of this clause were not sufficient to carry out the honest intention of the Government to give real facilities, then it was their duty as honourable men to alter the phraseology in such a way as to give effect to their intention. He had read the clause carefully, and he could foresee no difficulty at all. He could not defend the right of entry in the face of his constituents or in his own conscience on principle. He could only defend it as a compromise. It was only a matter of give and take. He asked the Government: What was the nature of the compromise? Was the compromise embodied in the Bill? He voted for the Second Reading, believing that the compromise was embodied in the Bill. Was that so? If they were to be met later on with further concessions, then he said that the whole situation had changed. If the Bill was an honest agreement between the Government on the one side and the Archbishop of Canterbury and other religious leaders on the other, then, although he disagreed with some of the clauses, he would vote for the Third Reading; but if it did not embody the compromise which had been come to, and if there were negotiations going on somewhere behind their backs, negotiations of which they knew nothing and which might mean further concessions, then so far as he was concerned his support of the Bill was gone. He supported the Bill last week as it stood. He did not mean to say that there might not be small adjustments here and there in the first Schedule. He was not going to haggle over a shilling or so when a great national settlement of a question which had been vexing the community for forty years was at hand. If the Bill went through the House substantially as it stood, it would have his support, not because it was an ideal measure, but because he hoped and believed it would put a stop for some years to come, if not for ever, to those factious and intolerable grievances and discussions which in the past had made the educational progress of the country almost impossible.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said the point they had to consider was whether this subsection made the obligation of the local education authority effective with respect to the right of entry desired by parents whose children were to receive denominational instruction. He regarded this as a business matter of vital importance. The speeches of the hon. Baronet and others were rather out of date. They had passed the Children Bill, which, following the precedent of previous legislation, provided for the system referred to as that of labelling the child as belonging to a particular denomination. The effective right to particular religious instruction was given under the poor law and also under the statutes affecting industrial schools. This was far more than a question of words; it was a question of principle. He hoped the Government would be able to accept the provision in the Industrial Schools Acts. It was very simple, the words being as follows:—

> "The local education authority shall, so far as is practicable, make arrangements that such children shall have facilities for receiving religious instruction in accordance with the parents' desires."

That was a duty cast upon the local education authority. This clause imposed no duty on the local authority except that of providing a room where it was practicable to do so between 9 and 9.45 a.m., where denominational religious instruction could be given to the children. Was that intentional or accidental? If it was intentional, it went to the root of the whole matter. Effective right of entry was absolutely impossible unless there was cast upon the local education authority a duty beyond that indicated in the clause. There were two different kinds of local education authority to be dealt with in this matter. A large number of authorities took a strong view as to their duty. Their desire was not to do more than they were absolutely required to do by the words of the Act, and so far as they were concerned it was essential that the duty should be cast upon them by the words of the statute. Otherwise, if they did not do their duty, there was no sort of redress. Lawyers knew that when proceedings were taken against a local education authority it was necessary to show that there had been a breach of statutory obligation. On the other hand there were many local education authorities who wished to do what was right and just as between two contending parties; they wished to do their duty honestly without any bias on one side or the other. He had got the moderate Churchman on the one side and the Nonconformists on the other, and then he had to look, and would look, at the exact words of the Act of Parliament, and say: "We must do this much, and no more, because

Parliament has laid down these lines of action." It was very important, if it was intended that any further duty was to be imposed on the local education authority, that it should be imposed on them in unmistakable terms. Here there was no obligation on the local authority that these three-quarters of an hour for denominational teaching should be in school hours at all. What made him think that that was not accidental on the part of the draftsman but intentional, was that different words were used when dealing with undenominational teaching. Unless they cast on the education authority the duty in the way he had indicated there was no sort of obligation on the local education authority that denominational teaching should be given in school hours at all. There was nothing to prevent the local education authority making the school attendance begin at 9.45 a.m.; and if they did that, the religious teaching would be given out of school hours. That would be a right of entry to a school which was not a school. Was that really an effective right of entry? He thought that the Government ought to accept the Amendment in order to make the right of entry effective. He need hardly say that all these points were fully in the minds of the local authorities who were hostile to the voluntary school. But assuming that they got the local education authority to decide that nine o'clock was to be the hour for commencing the teaching of denominational religion, and that was to be continued to 9.45 a.m, on two days a week——

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. and learned Member is discussing the next subsection.

MR. RAWLINSON said he would confine himself to this subsection. The only obligation cast on the local education authority was cast by this subsection. He could not discuss under this Amendment why the facilities proposed to be given were unreal, but unless he got a much more definite assurance from the Government on the points raised by himself and other speakers, he maintained that the right of entry was absolutely ineffective. Why he objected to subsection (1) was that it did not cast the duty on the local authority to say that religious instruction was to be given within the council schools. Under the Poor Law Acts and the Industrial School Acts it was provided that where the parent had proved himself unfit to give his child religious instruction, the local authority was forced, at the expense of the State, to say that the child was to receive proper religious instruction according to the denomination to which the parents belonged. But here, in the case of a parent who had proved himself to be a good parent, when he sent his child to a Church school, they proposed to hedge that right round to an extent which, the Committee would agree with him, made those facilities ineffective. He prayed the Government to put in this subsection words which would make it the distinctive duty of the local education authority to render the right of entry effective.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he wished to make an appeal to the Committee. On the previous day they discussed Clause 1, which embodied what the Church was expected to give up in connection with this Bill. This clause embodied some proposals which were intended to benefit the Church, but in its present shape, he thought it would be admitted, after the speech of his right hon. friend the Member for East Worcestershire, that there were many points which were ambiguous and required alteration and modification. Was it too much to ask that they should have an opportunity of hearing what the Government were prepared to concede in the way of giving greater precision to the clause, so as to allow the Committee to get at the bottom of what their intention really was? The night would be finished otherwise before they got to those details.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said he was very reluctant to take part in the debate, and he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he would not stand for more than a minute or two between him and the discussion of those matters which he very properly pointed out were interesting to the party which he represented. He was reluctant to take any part in the debate because he felt that this was a bargain entered into between the Nonconformists on the one hand and the members of the Church of England on the other, and because he associated himself with the views which had been largely expressed on the other side of the House below the gangway. He was in favour of a secular system of education, and therefore he felt he was an outsider in this matter, and that he had no right to intervene. But he could not help recalling the fact that he was the representative of a great Nonconformist constituency in the North of England, and he felt that it was due to his constituents to state briefly his view of this so-called compromise as it was effected by the Bill. As a Churchman he acquiesced in the compromise, *qua* Churchman. He had followed the debate that afternoon, especially the speeches delivered from the other side of the House, and what had impressed him was the absolute unreality of the criticisms which had been made against this clause; that the whole feeling of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition and those who agreed with him was one of profound dissatisfaction with the entire scope and purport of the Bill. He went further, and said that this Bill was a source of mixed gratification and dislike to the Church of England. He would go still further and say that were he a Nonconformist, which he was not, he should oppose this measure to the utmost of all his powers. He quite appreciated the spirit of his hon. friend who represented a Welsh constituency, because he believed that the Bill from a Church point of view could be and would be made unworkable in Wales. He thought that the local education authorities had under the Bill certain resources which would enable them to defeat what was intended by it. But in England the position was totally different. In England the great bulk of the local authorities who controlled the education of the children would be in sympathy with rather than antagonistic to the Church. The facilities given to the denominations of having access to the schools for denominational instruction to the children would, he believed, be made as facile as possible. This was called a compromise, and he had always been taught that a compromise was necessarily founded on some bilateral arrangement. But he would point out that he was unable to find—and he challenged the Leader of the Opposition to indicate—in what single respect this presumed compromise did not deal entirely in favour of the Church of England and against the Nonconformists. He did not want to indulge in generalities, but he asked what the elements of a compromise were to be? They were going to give up in single-school areas the whole denominational teaching.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire N.) inquired if it was in order for the hon. and learned Gentleman to refer to these matters. They wanted to get on with the rest of the clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. and learned Gentleman was certainly allowing himself very great latitude. He was listening to what he said, and so far as he could see he had been on his feet five minutes and he had not really approached the subsection they were discussing.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES said he was sorry that was the case. He understood this subsection to involve the questions as to whether or not in the provided schools this instruction was to be given. Of course, he bowed to the Chairman's decision, but he conceived that he was justified in pointing out what he thought to be the radical defect in this measure. He quite appreciated the motives of his hon. friend's intervention, and would not say more than this, that with regard to what he conceived to be the paramount effect of this section it was contended that the Nonconformists gained public control over every school in a single-school area, but that was accompanied by this curious anomaly, that in single-school areas the existing teachers were still to be allowed to teach dogmatic religion.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that did not arise on this subsection. All that this subsection did was to say that in the circumstances described the accommodation should be available. Another subsection dealt with the teacher.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES said he thought on this subsection it was competent for him, in accordance with the trend of the debates hitherto, to review the whole purport of the section. Previous speakers had dealt with the whole clause, and not with a single detached department of it. In view of the Chairman's ruling, however, he would bring his observations to a conclusion. Hon. Members on that side of the House must not imagine that he was speaking in any spirit of antagonism to the Government. He was desirous of seeing a *modus vivendi*, although he was precluded on this part of the discussion from stating his opinions. The allowing of the Church to have the right of access to provided schools was an invasion of that which had lasted for nearly forty years with the greatest advantage to the cause of education, and speaking as a Liberal, and as one who represented a Nonconformist constituency and sympathised with the Nonconformist attitude on this question, he for his part, although he gave the fullest credit to his right hon. friend for his desire to bring this controversy to a peaceful conclusion, could not help expressing his profound regret, which he was sure was echoed not only by Nonconformists, but by all those who loved education, that this solution of the question had been proposed by a Liberal Government.

MR. RUNCIMAN joined in the appeal of the Leader of the Opposition that the Committee should at once come to a decision on the Amendment. They had had a general debate on the subsection, and sometimes they had wandered over the other subsections in the clause, and it was necessary and desirable to come to a decision. There was no difference of opinion between the two sides on the main object of the Bill. They wanted to provide for a real right of entry, about which there was no doubt or suspicion, and it was only about the details of the Bill that there was any doubt. He hoped the Committee would come to a decision on this subsection, and then they could get on to the other subsections.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) was rather surprised at the appeal by the Leader of the Opposition to bring this discussion to a close, considering that this particular Amendment emanated from his own side of this House. He was not aware that anyone had spoken from those benches as to the right of entry. For the fourth time they were discussing the question of the religious welfare of the workman's child, and he wished to say, as a workman whose children attended a public elementary school and as a Churchman, that he was just as anxious to have this question settled as any hon. Member in the House, but he was not going to assent to its being settled if the settlement proved to be inefficient from an educational standpoint. There were people who said they had discussed the religious well-being of the workman's child too long, and had neglected the other educational interests of the children from a mental and physical point of view, and therefore he believed if they could have a peaceful and honourable settlement of this question, he and his friends would not stand in the way. But he ventured to think they were not going to have a peaceful settlement by this particular Bill. Instead of having peace in the public elementary schools under this Bill, he ventured to assert that they were going to have confusion and discord. As one whose children attended public elementary schools he had never yet heard of religious differences inside those schools, although they certainly had a good deal of talk by eminent clerics whom he respected. But this was a parent's question as well as a cleric's question, and he joined with the hon. Gentleman who said that the two people principally affected had not been consulted, viz., the parents and the teachers. He ventured to think that if they gave a right of entry to all the various denominations to teach their particular creeds they would not bring about that education of the children that they desired to see, and that they would spread the confusion and discord to which he had referred. But if there was going to be a settlement of the question he must admit that they had to give fair play to all the creeds and denominations if they once conceded the right of entry. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill not to relax in any way what he had settled with regard to the demand of the parents to have a religious education for their children. He ventured to say that, if the right hon. Gentleman insisted that the parents must apply for the religious education of their children, in two or three years he would have his eyes opened, and would realise as far as the parents were concerned that they were not so excited or animated with regard to these religious differences as they were led to believe in the House. He hoped, therefore, if they were to have this concession as to the right of entry, that the right hon. Gentleman would adhere to the form that he had set up that the parents must make the necessary application. As to the clergymen, he knew clergymen of all denominations, and he did not think they were so enthusiastic as to turn out every morning to go down to the schools to give religious education. He ventured to think that their eyes would be opened from that standpoint also, and that the clergymen were not so keen as they were led to believe they would be to give this religious education to the children. In conclusion, for himself, and he thought for his colleagues, he looked with suspicion upon this concession of the right of entry, and he thought that in order to prevent that peace in council schools which now existed being disturbed, he must go into the division lobby and vote against this particular part of the clause.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 239 ; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 423.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn Sir Alex.F
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Armitage, R.
Ashley, W. W.
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn.Sir H.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chance, Frederick William
Cleland, J. W.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Grant, Corrie
Guinness,Hon. R.(Haggerston)
Gulland, John W.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)

Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncastr
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Percy, Earl
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Rt.Hn.H.L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De D. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
Whitehead, Rowland
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williamson, A.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Dt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Bowerman, C. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cross, Alexander
Curran, Peter Francis
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doughty, Sir George
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Kekewich, Sir George
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Maddison, Frederick
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Radford, G. H.
Renwick, George
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Shackleton, David James
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Snowden, P.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Hazel and Mr. Pickersgill.

MR. HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said the Amendment he now proposed to move would have the effect of limiting the privilege the Committee had just conceded to the transferred voluntary schools. The right of entry should not be extended to the council schools of the country, those schools which had grown up in the land in which no kind of denominational teaching had ever been given. Hereafter denominational teaching of any kind should be confined to the transferred voluntary schools. He supposed the granting of this right of entry was a part of a larger scheme, that it was part of a bargain and did not stand by itself. He had often heard that in that bargain the Nonconformists had given up something in permitting this right of entry into the council schools; but the Nonconformists had no right to give up anything. It was not in the province of the Nonconformists as such to yield this privilege of right of entry into the elementary schools. They were State schools, the property was State property, the schools were organised and maintained by the State, and it was wrong to say that this concession had been made by the Nonconformists. He had never claimed that the Nonconformists as such had any special rights in the council schools. Cowper-Temple teaching was not Nonconformist. It was inserted in the Act of 1870 in order to please the Conservative party, and he noticed whenever there was any chance of its disappearing the Archbishop of Canterbury came forward and stipulated that it should continue to be given in the schools. Cowper-Temple teaching had not, and never had been, in any sense Nonconformist teaching, and the Nonconformists as such had no right to give this concession. From a letter which appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* on the previous day it would be seen that the Bishop of St. Asaph did not regard this Bill as sufficient. The Bishop of St. Asaph required more facilities for contracting-out, a more extended rent for the schools to be transferred, and other conditions added to it. His own fear was that the Government had conceded this right of entry into the council schools without there being any prospect that this would be an end of the difficulty. Already more was being demanded. The hands of his right hon. friend were tied, but those of the Bishop of St. Asaph and of the Archbishop of Canterbury were not, and already those gentlemen were coming forward and saying they must have more. He thought he had shown that these negotiations had not been altogether wisely carried on by the representatives of the Government. The terms of settlement would never have been assented to by his right hon. friend but for one thing, that they were to have educational peace. Was this kind of right of entry into the council schools of the country to bring educational peace? They were going to destroy the unity of the schools, they were going to destroy simplicity of administration. By Clause 1, not a word of which had been discussed, they had made the teaching of religion absolutely compulsory, and added to that was the right of the parent to require religious instruction for his children. They were to have a division of scholars into the sheep and the goats; but more than that, they would also have trouble outside the schools. They were certain to have canvassing of the parents. Did his right hon. friend look at that prospect with equanimity? There was another right of entry which the parents had gained, and it was in connection with free education. Free education was impossible to a great many parents because the only school in their district charged a fee. There was no alternative school within reach, and the only right was the right to demand a free place for a child. But that very rarely succeeded. He remembered one instance where the fathers wanted free education for their children, and a number of them banded together for the purpose of achieving their object. No sooner had they presented their petition for free education than the curates went to the mothers, who signed another petition to the authorities asking them to refuse the free education asked for by their husbands. Now, they were certain to have this kind of canvassing. They were inviting it. They would certainly have the clerical interest at once set to work to get up a petition by the fathers or mothers, whichever were the more easily persuaded, to demand this right for themselves and their children inside the public elementary schools. Frankly, he thought he would rather have a Church school in the village than have put upon the parents the difficulty of having to refuse the request of the clergy to demand facilities in the schools for religious teaching. Social boycott was absolutely certain to follow refusal. What was to happen in the village where at present there was only a council school? At any rate there was peace there now, but were they going to have it in the future? Wherever they had church schools or council schools they were introducing educational warfare and social warfare as well. He deplored the result of the proposals of his right hon. friend. Who was going to enjoy this right of entry? The parents were going to have the right to demand a special kind of religious instruction. Was it to be limited to the Roman Catholics, and the Church of England, and certain Nonconformists? There was a church called the Labour Church. Had the parents who were members of that the right to demand for their children special religious instruction? The hon. Member for Oxford University was anxious about the way in which the council schools would be used on Sundays. He remembered a little more than a year ago his catechising the First Lord of the Admiralty about the use of council schools on Sundays for the instruction of children in Socialistic doctrines. Take the Labour Church. Were parents who were members of that church to have the right to demand for their children special religious instruction? What kind of religious instruction would it be? Were they opening the door to catechisms of all kinds, political and religious as well? He saw no reason why they were not. He saw no sign in that clause of educational peace. On the contrary, he saw great difficulty, canvassing, and boycotting. Lord Londonderry said this proposal had "neither practicability nor popularity," and when the right hon. Gentleman opposite had charge of the Education Bill of 1902 they all knew what his opinion was. He said it was an idea greatly favoured, but he did not think it was possible to put it into force. He failed to see why one man was allowed to steal the horse while another man was not allowed to look over the hedge. His hon. right friend opposite must marvel now at his own moderation in 1902 in this respect. He thought that the case made on the proposal in 1902 ought not to be given away by the present Government, and he hoped that even yet they would have his right hon. friend announcing, when he came to find himself under the pressure of the Archbishops and the Bishops to give further securities, that he had already gone beyond what he thought were the limits of the case. He forbore quoting his right hon. friends on the Treasury bench. He could quote them all, but he thought it rather a humiliating position when a whole Government could be quoted in a sense contrary to the principles of their Bill, and contrary to one of its main provisions. It was said that the Bill was to bring peace. On the contrary he thought that the Bill would do more harm to education and religion than any other proposal that he had known any Government to make itself responsible for since he had been in the House.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 20 and 21, to leave out the words 'public elementary school provided by the local education authority,' and to insert the words 'transferred voluntary school.'"—(*Mr. Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. RUNCIMAN said he made no complaint against his hon. friend for the speech which he had just delivered. It was exactly what one might have expected from him, for he was nothing if he was not consistent, though he was consistent to the point of being impracticable. The hon. Gentleman would rather be consistent than see anything done for the parents who now had to send their children to the village schools. He would rather be consistent than free the teachers who, in those village schools, were subject to religious tests; and there, he must say, he parted company with his hon. friend. He thought the advantage of freeing these village schools and teachers was so great that they were justified now in giving away the power which they possessed of exclusion from all the council schools of the country. His hon. friend said that his hands were already tied, and had practically suggested that the representatives of the English Church had got the better of him in this bargain. As he understood, there were some Members in the House who thought it was he who had got the better of the representatives of the Church in this bargain. He was inclined to think that when both sides complained, the Government could not be very far wrong. He did not object to his hon. friend making references to some of the speeches made by Ministers in the past against the right of entry. But it should be remembered that the right of entry which was then spoken of was a right of entry put forward as a distinct act of agression. They were not offered anything by the other side, and they were not to gain control by the council of a single parish school. But the case was now entirely changed, and they had a distinct and substantial offer made. He was quite sure that hon. Gentlemen opposite would not for one moment say that the offer made by the Church was not a substantial offer. His hon. friend drew a lugubrious picture of the facilities in operation. He said that in most cases there would be canvassing among the parents to send their children to these schools. They must all admit that there had been clergymen in the past, and there might be now, who had abused their position, but this would not enable them to abuse it any more than they had abused it in the past. Did his hon. friend suggest that he could prohibit the vicar of a parish from visiting his parishioners? If the vicar of a parish abused his position, he presumed there were ways of dealing with him. After all, the vicar of a parish had not altogether a very easy task. In many parishes the vicar would find it difficult to carry on Church work if he abused his position. He would gain for himself unpopularity in his own parish, and he might throw up the sponge at once because his work for good there would be absolutely gone. He did not say there might not be cases where pressure was brought to bear on the parents of children quite unjustifiably. He quite admitted that many parents might submit, but he doubted very much, if this settlement went through, that they would find the system abused. After all, they must remember the altered temper which existed in relation to matters of education. During the whole of this controversy in the past, each side had been in its trenches, and each had fired on the other whenever it got a chance, but neither had ever left its trenches. The local administration of the country had been coloured by the controversy, and, as he had said on previous occasions, coloured to the detriment of education. If this settlement went through, as he hoped it would, it would give satisfaction to the great body of administrators, and to those who sent their children to the schools. They would have in the whole of the constituencies of the country, in the county councils and the borough councils, a feeling of amity which had not been known in educational matters for ten years past; and the only justification he had for asking his hon. friend's support of the right of entry into council schools was that it was a bargain, and they could not expect at this hour the Church to fulfil her part of the bargain if they adopted the advice of his hon. friend and withheld the very thing which she regarded as one of the most treasured items.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 273; Noes, 56. (Division List No. 424.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Agnew, George William
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Armitage, R.
Ashley, W. W.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chance, Frederick William
Cleland, J. W.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry

Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dobson, Thomas W.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fell, Arthur
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gladstone,Rt Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, Hon. R.(Haggerston)
Gulland, John W.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmsley, Viscount
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Hope,W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt. Hon.Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of

King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Percy, Earl
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rendall, Athelstan
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Ronaldshay, Earl of

Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Rt.Hn.H.L.(Cleveland
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw,Sir CharlesEdw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williamson, A.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doughty, Sir George
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harvey,W. E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Maddison, Frederick
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Radford, G. H.
Renwick, George
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Snowden, P.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Walsh, Stephen
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Hutton and Mr. Yoxall.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme) who had given notice of his intention to move to insert after the word 'authority' the words 'disapproves of, or is dissatisfied with, on conscientious grounds the religious instruction which it is open to the local education authority to give in accordance with subsection 2 of section 14 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, and in consequence" said: I gather that my Amendment cannot be accepted, and that it would upset the nice equipoise of the Bill. I do not, therefore, move.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL in moving to leave out the word "desires," and insert the words "expresses a desire that," said a parent applying for special instruction or his child was put to considerable trouble, inconvenience, and delay. He would repeat the question he had put a few moments ago, whether it was intended that these regulations should be issued at once on the authority of the Education Department, or whether they were to be laid on the Table of the House with opportunities for discussing them during a reasonable number of weeks. He hoped the latter course would be adopted, because it would give opportunity for consultation and discussion, and he believed it would facilitate the carrying out of the regulations. Knowing, as he did, something of the habits of the working classes in our manufacturing towns, he thought six weeks would be in many cases extremely inconvenient. The most worthy members of the class moved from one part of the town to another. Opportunities of work in a particular mill or factory varied from time to time and they were obliged to change their residence. He was quite sure they would feel it a very great hardship to be called upon to issue new applications on every occasion. These points were really of very great importance. He wished to remove doubts and to say something which might conduce to such modifications of these regulations as might procure their more effective working.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 21, to leave out the word 'desires,' and insert the words 'expresses a desire that.' "—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'desires' stand part of the clause."

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said the Government had no objection to accepting this Amendment. It appeared in effect to be a verbal Amendment and expressed perhaps a little more clearly the object they had in view. The Prime Minister had made it perfectly clear that these regulations were only put forward as a draft with a view to seeing what the authorities of the Church thought of them. With regard to the term of six weeks before the commencement of the school, he wished to make it clear what the Minister for Education intended. It was thought that there should be full opportunity for the facilities being started at the beginning of the term. There was a vacation of four weeks before one of the terms, and the idea was that the parents should express their desire for facilities by giving an announcement of their desire before the last term came to a conclusion. The Government felt it would very likely be preferred that this request should be made a week before the term started, and they simply put forward the period named as their first proposal. If they gathered that it was the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite and the authorities in the Church that it would be simpler and more satisfactory to have a shorter period the Government would be ready to accept that general view, and make the regulations in accordance with the general desire of those parents who wished to have the facilities.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) said the point which he thought was of great importance was that the desire to be expressed by the parents for Cowper-Temple religion and for special religion should be expressed identically in the same manner. It was most undesirable from his point of view that there should be any difference in the manner of expressing the desire of the parent for Cowper-Temple teaching and for special religious teaching. As the Bill stood at the present moment no method of expressing the desire of the parent was laid down, although it was mandatory upon the authority to set aside for three-quarters of an hour the school for Cowper-Temple teaching for the children whose parents desired that they should receive that instruction. There was no provision at all as to how that desire was to be expressed or ascertained. Did the Government presume that intention, or, if no desire was expressed, would the child be obliged to have secular education? Subsection (*b*) of Section 1 set aside for three-quarters of an hour the school for Cowper-Temple teaching, but it enacted that that teaching should be given to those parents who desired the children to receive that instruction. No provision was made in the Bill prescribing the mode by which the desire of the parent was to be expressed or how it was to be ascertained by the local authority. He wished to know specifically if no desire was expressed one way or the other, would Cowper-Temple instruction be given to the child automatically? If that were so, he submitted with great respect that it was not right that, in the absence of any express desire for Cowper-Temple instruction, that instruction should be taught as a matter of form. Obviously what was fair was that the expression of both desires should be in the same form, and should not be influenced in the smallest degree by the procedure of the local education authority. The Prime Minister had expressed his desire to treat both forms of religious teaching with absolute fairness and equality, and it was very important to obtain that result.

MR. RUNCIMAN did not know whether this point was quite germane to the Amendment, but in answer to the right hon. Gentleman he might say that they proposed, with regard to Cowper-Temple teaching, to leave it in exactly the same position as it was now. It would be a very serious matter for the Government to disturb an arrangement which had stood good for thirty-eight years and was well recognised by parents all over the country. They did not propose to make any change as regarded Cowper-Temple teaching.

LORD R. CECIL said the Government on this point spoke as if this proposal was only to apply to council schools. If the principle of the right hon. Gentleman was to be observed——

*THE CHAIRMAN: I allowed this question to be put, although I thought it was very doubtful whether it was in order. What the noble Lord is now doing is arguing upon something we have already disposed of upon Clause 1.

LORD R. CECIL contended that he was not out of order because he was opposed to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wigan, which seemed to him to increase the difference between the two forms of religious instruction which already appeared in the Bill. He thought he was entitled to reply to the Minister for Education who desired that a distinction should exist, and he had accepted the Amendment on the ground that it emphasised that point. On this Amendment he claimed that he was entitled to show why he did not desire any difference made between Cowper-Temple teaching and religious instruction of a different character. The Board of Education had justified the treatment of Cowper-Temple instruction differently in this respect from denominational religious teaching, because the right hon. Gentleman said that Cowper-Temple instruction had for thirty-eight years been the rule, and parents all over the country knew what their rights were in regard to it. That, however, was the reverse of the fact when they came to deal with transferred voluntary schools. He did not think it was a good argument even with reference to council schools, but it was clearly bad when they dealt with transferred voluntary schools. If the view of the right hon. Gentleman was to be carried out, what they ought to provide was that in every transferred voluntary school the old religious teaching should be given as a matter of course, and it should only be when the parents expressed a desire for Cowper-Templeism that they should get it in those schools. This seemed to him to be a really crucial question, and he thought it was a point on which they were entitled to test the reality of the facilities offered. Unless a real, fair, and unbiassed choice was given it would be, to use the expression of the hon. Member for North-West Ham, playing with loaded dice, and he desired that they should deal fairly and absolutely impartially between the two kinds of religious instruction. Unless that was the intention of the Government these facilities would be exactly as they were described by the hon. Member for Richmond, namely, a mere temporary salving of the consciences of Churchmen, which was intended to pass away, leaving a universal undenominational system of religious instruction throughout the country. The real question was, were these facilities to be effective or not? He did not believe that the bishops and archbishops who had gone so lightly into these negotiations intended that Cowper-Temple religion should be given an advantage from the outset. He did not believe that was their intention now. They thought evidently that in these provisions—he did not think they were all familiar with the construction of Acts of Parliament—they had got a real, definite, and effective right of entry. Unless the two forms of religious instruction were treated impartially they had not got an impartial right of entry. He was asking for complete impartiality and not for anything new.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have been looking into the point of order. I do not see how this matter can be raised on this Amendment. I think, however, it can be raised on the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for West St. Pancras.

LORD R. CECIL said in that case he would not proceed with his remarks and he hoped the hon. Baronet would not press his Amendment.

MR. JAMES HOPE urged his hon. friend not to press his Amendment.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said his desire was to make the provisions as to both teachings identical, but the course of the debate under the restrictions imposed had rendered it impossible to raise that issue, and therefore he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment because it had already served the purpose he intended.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) said that before leave was given to withdraw the Amendment he wished to invite the President of the Board of Education to give an answer to the point raised by his right hon. friend as to whether the form in which the parents' desire was to be expressed was really the same in regard to Cowper-Temple teaching as it was in regard to special religious teaching in the transferred schools. The right hon. Gentleman did not answer that point, and he hoped he would tell the Committee now whether they were to express their desire in the same form and language.

MR. RUNCIMAN did not think it was necessary to follow up the point, because the hon. Member knew what happened now in regard to Cowper-Temple teaching. He was equally well aware that in voluntary schools on four days in the week and sometimes on three days in the week there was given what was almost identical with Cowper-Temple teaching in those schools. [Cries of "No."] It was proposed that in the transferred voluntary schools the education should be treated in the same way as before. The system would not be altered.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON Oxford University) said the right hon. Gentleman had not put the matter in a very satisfactory way. Under the present arrangement as the law stood, the child attending a council school got Cowper-Temple teaching. The child who went to a voluntary school got automatically the religious teaching of the denomination to which the school belonged. It might very well be that ordinarily what might be called Christian teaching in certain Church schools would differ very materially from the teaching given in council schools. As he understood the right hon. Gentleman, it was proposed that Cowper-Temple teaching should be the normal teaching, and that the child should get it automatically whether the parent expressed any desire or not, but that in the case of other teaching there should be an expression of desire on the part of the parent. If the right hon. Gentleman meant that, he wished to call his attention to the fact that the Bill had not said so. The words of the first section did require that the parent should express a desire that his child should receive certain teaching. Hitherto there had been no requirement of any such expression on the part of the parent, and, therefore the first clause as it stood, did not express the intention of the right hon. Gentleman. The clause which they were discussing did not express what he and his friends wished to see expressed, and he would point out that the only way to solve the difficulty was to throw on the local education authority the onus of ascertaining what was the desire of the parent in every case in respect of the religious instruction to be given to his child.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Runciman.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) moved an Amendment providing that where the parent of any child in attendance at a public elementary school provided by the local education authority desired that child to receive religious instruction, the authority shall make available any accommodation in the schoolhouse which can reasonably be so made available. He admitted that this Amendment lost some of its point, because, on account of the falling of the guillotine (for which he did not vote) on the previous night, he had not been able to move an Amendment to Paragraph (*b*) of Clause 1, of which he had given notice, and which, if it had been carried, would have made the proposal symmetrical. His object was to secure perfect equality of treatment in respect of Cowper-Templeism and denominational religion, to draw no distinction as to the use of the school premises between the two. When the Bill of 1906 was before the House he voted for the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Burnley, which proposed that any religious instruction given in school premises should be outside the school curriculum, and not at the public expense. He desired to raise that question now, in so far as it could be raised on this Amendment. Those who objected to the right of entry founded their objection mainly on the fact that the religious instruction would be part of the school curriculum. A great deal of that objection would be removed if, while the use of the school premises was allowed for religious teaching, that teaching was apart from and not a part of the school curriculum provided at the public expense. He wished to draw no distinction, so far as the use of the school premises was concerned, between Cowper-Templeism and other religious instruction. That might be regarded as closely similar to what was spoken of as the secular solution, but now that so much deference was being paid to the wishes of the parent, in regard to religion it necessarily followed that the religious instruction ought to be given outside the compulsory curriculum of the school and at the expense of those who wished to have their religion taught. Students of Stuart Mill would remember that the reason he gave to justify the intervention of the State in the matter of education was that the case was not one in which the judgment of the consumer was a sufficient guarantee for the goodness of the commodity. In the particular case of religious instruction the judgment of the parent was now supposed to be a sufficient guarantee for the goodness of the commodity, and on the principle laid down by Mill this ought not therefore to be a matter for State intervention, but ought to be dealt with outside the compulsory curriculum of the school. He saw no objection to the proposal that the granting of the use of the school premises should be obligatory on the local education authority, subject to the condition that the accommodation could reasonably be made available. At present school premises were let at almost nominal rentals for a great variety of purposes. In some cases they had been let for Socialist schools on Sunday, and if they were let for that purpose, he could not see why they should not be available outside of school hours for those children whose parents desired that they should receive instruction in accordance with the tenets which they held.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 21, to leave out from the word 'instruction,' to the word 'make,' in line 27, and to insert the words 'the authority shall.'"—(*Sir W. J. Collins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'that,' in line 22, stand part of the clause."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said he recognised the importance of the Amendment, especially from the point of view of hon. Members opposite. But the issues were well understood. The question here was whether there should be any form of religious teaching which should operate normally in the schools. But the local authority could not tell to which of the various denominations in its district the parents wished to adhere, and the parent had to make a selection if he wished a special form of religious teaching to be given to his child. Did hon. Members opposite, who were most likely to support this Amendment, wish that a large number of parents who might be indifferent, apathetic, or careless should have no form of religious teaching automatically provided? He supposed that among the adherents of religious teaching there were many persons who would rather see some elementary form of religious instruction automatically provided, even though they might not agree with it or believe that it satisfied their wants. The effect of the Amendment would be to disestablish and disendow religious education in general, only leaving it applicable in cases where the parent was sufficiently in earnest about it to make a specific request. He did not think that this was exactly what hon. Members opposite meant, while on the point raised by the Amendment the Bill did make a distinction between Cowper-Templeism and other forms of religious instruction. His noble friend the Member for East Marylebone desired an explicit answer from the Government on the point. He thought that was reasonably clear on the face of the Bill itself. In Clause 2 power was given to the Board of Education to make regulations as to the manner in which the parent was to communicate with the local education authority. There was no such power in Clause 1. He thought that was a distinction. Did hon. Members really desire that there should be no distinction whatever between the normal religious teaching of the school and the teaching which required to be specified and particularly demanded in writing? It was a very remarkable tribute to the attitude of the community towards the provision in the Act of 1870 with regard to Cowper-Temple teaching. That provision had worked without complaint, without suspicion, without friction, and without difficulty throughout the country. He understood that only thirty local authorities in England and Wales did not adopt that provision. Why, then, should this rule be withdrawn? The Amendment, he thought, would put a novel and unnecessary impediment, though a slight one, to the giving of religious instruction, and he thought that on reflection the hon. Member would not consider that that was desirable. The Bill itself was founded on the assumption that there should be a form of religious teaching.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he thought that it was quite possible to effect what they wanted without creating any invidious distinction between this or that form of religious teaching. He entirely agreed with the Attorney-General that it would be a pity in many parts of our crowded towns where parents were indifferent and there was not that access to various forms of spiritual advice which would bring home to them their responsibility to their children, that the parents should be called upon to give their opinion before the children received any religious instruction at all. Might it not be assumed in every school that the parents desired their children to have some religious instruction? Might they not on that assumption make it the duty of the local education authority to ascertain what form of religious instruction the parent desired? That might be done without imposing any undue burden on the local authority and without making any invidious distinction between one form of religious teaching and another; and would secure that every child would get the religious teaching which the parent desired.

LORD R. CECIL said he had listened to the Attorney-General's speech with considerable interest. The argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman was that there should be a State form of religion.

SIR W. ROBSON said he certainly never said anything of the sort; he was the last man in the House to say so.

LORD R. CECIL said he did not know what on earth the hon. and learned Gentleman meant then in his speech. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that in the case of apathetic parents who would not say whether their children should have any religious teaching at all, the local authorities should see that some form of religious teaching was given. As he understood the argument on the other side, it was that there ought to be established and endowed in every school some form of religious teaching, which might be of a particular character or no particular character, and that that was to be given to all children unless the parents took the trouble to demand under the terms of an Act of Parliament, religious instruction of a different character which they desired. He maintained that that was not just, that that was not making the facilities for giving special religious teaching effective. They were loading the dice. They were saying that one form of religious teaching should be given. They were not dealing on this section with the question whether the religious teaching should be paid for by the parents or whether there should be freedom of religious teaching. What they were arguing now was that the parent should be asked when his child came to school: "What particular form of religious teaching do you want for your child?" That was done in the day industrial schools of the country with perfect satisfaction to all concerned; so that there was nothing novel in what they were asking by this Amendment. They were only asking what was already the law with regard to the industrial schools, and that did not seem to him to be an excessive demand. The hon. Member for Morley said that this provision requiring a petition from the parents would infallibly lead to canvassing by the ecclesiastical individuals whom he called curates, and the hon. Gentleman thought there was a danger in that. He was delighted and refreshed to hear from an hon. Gentleman opposite that the charge was quite unfounded that opportunities were made use of by the clergy of the Church of England to put unfair pressure on the parents of the children in the parish who were not members of their denomination to sign petitions in favour of religious instruction. If such a danger existed, it would absolutely disappear if it was made the duty of the State to say when a child came to school: "What religious teaching do you want? That religious teaching which you want shall be given to you within the limits of practicability." Surely that was simple justice. He could not understand how, when they had the example of the system working well in the day industrial schools, which had produced the most admirable results, and had never divided the *esprit de corps* of the schools, they should adopt a newfangled system which had nothing to be said for it except that it would put the voluntary schools at a disadvantage.

*MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) said he was quite unable to accept the view of the noble Lord as to a special form of religious teaching. Many of those on that side of the House would not support this Bill, or help this suggested compromise, if they thought it was going to upset the practice followed for so many years of Cowper-Temple teaching being the ordinary religious teaching as matter of course in the public elementary schools. There was this difference between that teaching and the special teaching which the noble Lord had so ably and conscientiously put before this House, that the latter was connected with the fortunes and desires of particular religious societies, and if those ideals were carried out by this Amendment they would have every school in the country a place in which rival religious organisations were laying the greatest stress on all sorts of teaching which was in the highest degree controversial, and which was bound to be for the interest of particular religious societies.

LORD R. CECIL desired to point out that none of these criticisms turned out to be accurate when they dealt with the day industrial schools.

*MR. ADKINS said he was coming to the day industrial schools, which loomed so large in the noble Lord's view. Whatever might be said against Cowper-Temple teaching, it had during the last thirty-five years proved less controversial, and led to less acute differences, than any other more complete forms of religious instruction, and when they had to deal with the undoubted fact that there were many persons who did not look at these things with the theological acumen of the noble Lord there was great ground for having a less controversial form of religious teaching made the ordinary common procedure of the school, except for parents who wished to withdraw their children from it. The noble Lord seemed to build his argument most specially on the day industrial schools, but when they were dealing with them and with reformatories the segregation had taken place before the school was formed.

LORD R. CECIL: No; not in the ordinary day industrial school.

*MR. ADKINS said the ordinary day industrial school had to deal with a particular type of child who was best dealt with there, and was not left free to go to an ordinary school in the neighbourhood, and, therefore, they were not dealing with the general competition and general access of any child in the neighbourhood, and they were not dealing with the ordinary kind of child. He did not, in this friendly discussion, wish to use any expression which was too polemical, but he would remark that in the day industrial school and in the reformatory the problem was easier, because Nonconformity provided no appreciable *quota* to the insubordinate or criminal classes. He did not wish to base his support of the Government on any facts of a kind which might be looked upon in a different way. He wished to base his support of the Government on the general ground that Cowper-Templeism had worked well for thirty-five years, and if this compromise was to go through, the feelings of those who supported board schools and council schools through all this period must be considered, and Cowper-Templeism, if not by its defects, by its merits, led less to controversy, and was less connected with the particular interest of religious societies than any other teaching, and, therefore stood on a different footing. There was no reason, therefore, why the general uniform type of Cowper-Temple teaching, which had raised no acute dislike in the schools, should not remain where it was to-day in the ordinary life of the school.

MR. LYTTELTON said that for his part he could not support this Amendment because, although he quite agreed with the spirit of it, viz., that which dictated that all forms of religion should be admitted, he certainly could not support that part of it which laid it down that in the absence of an expression of opinion from the parent the child should receive no religious education at all. That, he thought, was absolutely inadmissible, and he was sure if hon. Members would consider for a moment, if they placed any value on religious education at all, they would agree that it would be deplorable that the children of the drunkard and the wastrel, who very often grew up to be excellent citizens, should be deprived of that which they specially stood in need. He only got up to say that in order to make his own position perfectly clear, because, although he ventured to disapprove of that portion of the hon. Member's Amendment, he entirely approved of the principle which would give equality between the religions. As to that, he did not wish to add a single word to what had been said by his noble friend behind him or his hon. friend the Member for the University of Oxford.

*MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said the cardinal distinction which had now been introduced was that in the case of denominational teaching they could only give one kind, but when they came to what he preferred to call fundamental Christian teaching, but which had most unfortunately been called Cowper-Templeism, they could give that concurrently with denominational teaching. Under the present Bill they would have three days a week for fundamental Christian teaching and two days a week for denominational, in both cases by desire of the parents. They were not going to give the child Wesleyan and Church of England teaching, but they were going to take the fundamental Christian teaching and give that for three days a week, and on the top of that came denominational teaching, with which it in no way conflicted but for which it furnished the very best ground. That was the distinction on which the whole compromise and Bill was based on its religious side, and he thought it a fair one. Its fairness had been proved by upwards of thirty-five years successful teaching in the school board and council schools, and on Sunday they had denominational teaching of the kind given in Sunday schools up and down the country concurrently with fundamental Christian teaching given on week-days. Nobody had ever heard one single word in the undenominational teaching against any form of denominationalism, and because there had been that broad basis of fundamental Christianity therefore there had been the great success to which he had alluded, and which had been testified to by many leading churchmen, archbishops, bishops, and by laymen who were loyal churchmen.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) said he certainly desired that every child should receive some form of religious education, but he did not think he could support the Amendment, because it struck out of the Bill the first and, he thought, only effective reference to religious education other than Cowper-Templeism, and if it were accepted they should be left without any reference to special religious instruction in the Bill at all. Under those circumstances his hon. friend would see that it was impossible for them to support the Amendment, and he had only risen to make that quite clear.

*MR. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham) said he rose mainly for the purpose of uttering a few words of protest against the statement of his noble friend the Member for Marylebone that under this Bill it was intended, or it ought to be the case, that there should be complete equality with regard to undenominational and denominational religion. After all, they were discussing not so much what ought to take place in the abstract, but what as a matter of fact was the agreement between the President of the Board of Education and the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was true the details of that agreement might not be settled, but certain things were already settled, as they saw by the correspondence which had already passed. It seemed clear from that that the Archbishop of Canterbury did not intend that denominational teaching should be in anything like the same position as undenominational teaching. The Archbishop had already agreed that they should differ, seeing that Church children were to receive Cowper-Temple instruction on three days in the week and Church teaching on two days. Undoubtedly, therefore, denominational teaching was to be on quite a different footing from undenominational. The Archbishop had also agreed that undenominational teaching should be paid for by the State, while denominational teaching was not to be paid for in that way; also that the head teacher should be allowed to give undenominational teaching, and above all that the Cowper-Templeism should be compulsory upon local authorities. In the face of all that, how was it possible to say that it was intended that denominational teaching shou'd have equal advantages with undenominational? What was intended, and what he believed would be carried out, was a right of entry which would be made an effective one and which could be used by every parent who desired it. He did not think it had even been suggested by anyone until that afternoon that Cowper-Templeism and denominational teaching were on the same footing. If he might make an egotistical remark, he might say that all this trouble would have been avoided if the Government had accepted his Amendment that the word "permits" instead of the word "desires" should be inserted in Clause 1. The hon. Member for Oxford University had put forth a most specious proposition which on its face appeared to be fair all round. The hon. Gentleman had said that he was much inpressed with the argument of the Attorney-General that unless there was some State form of undenominational religion in the schools a large number of the children of this country would go without any religious instruction at all. That was true. There would be an overwhelming number. Not more than one out of ten of the working classes ever attended a place of worship on Sundays, and although he might say he was a member of a particular denomination because his grandmother or mother was a member of it, everybody knew very well that he was not. The hon. Member for Oxford University saw very clearly that it would not do to say there should not be some normal form of religious instruction, and therefore made the specious suggestion that it should be the duty of the local authority to ascertain from the parents of the children who came to the schools what religion they belonged to. In his opinion that was a most pernicious thing to do. It would only result in crossexamining people who had no religious convictions whatever. It was absurd for the local authority to go out of its way to try and find out what religion the parents wished their children taught, and unless the parents actually came forward and said they desired their children to be brought up in a particular denomination, in his opinion the local authority should put these children with those whose parents were content that they should be taught those common principles of Christianity which underlay all systems of denominational teaching, and without which no denomination could exist.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) thought that it would be better if the Committee could get rid of the Amendment and proceed to something that was more practicable, because he did not see how the Amendment could become part of the Bill. He took exception to the remarks of the hon. Member for Faversham. He had understood that the hon. Member had been very active in attempting to obtain religious education, but the gist of his arguments now was that nine-tenths of the parents of the children of the country did not care whether their children had any religious education or not.

*Mr. NAPIER said he did not intend to say that and hoped he did not say so. What he meant was that nine-tenths of the parents had no bias in favour of any particular denomination.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY said the evidence they had was in an entirely opposite direction, seeing that all the years that these provided schools had been existing there had been a strong bias in favour of the denominational schools which were for some time in a large majority. So far as anybody reading the Bill was concerned, the use of the word "desires" by the parent pointed to equality of treatment, and except for a very acute lawyer he imagined that that would be the understanding arrived at. He personally was strongly in favour of the provisions of the Bill, especially those with regard to the right of entry, but the right of entry, to be made effective, must not suffer from any disadvantageous treatment except the fact that Cowper-Templeism was to be the established, normal, and endowed religion of the schools, while the other religions were unendowed.

*MR. MASSIE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said from his point of view it would be far more just to put both Cowper-Templeism and denominationalism out of schoolhours altogether, but as this was a compromise he was going to support it. But he would much regret if one of the results of the compromise were to be to institute a practically compulsory creed register for all the parents in the schools. He would prefer to leave it to the parents to register themselves if they desired.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) said he could not understand why hon. Members should not recognise the possibility of equality of treatment between Cowper-Templeism and denominationalism. This equality existed in the day industrial schools, the poor law schools, and the military and naval schools of this country, and in no single instance had it given rise to any friction or any difficulty. He could not help greatly regretting that the Government had not been able to proceed upon these lines. They had the instances of its success before them which he had already mentioned, and they had not to go far abroad to see how the same principle succeeded. They had only to go to Germany to see how well that system worked, especially in Bavaria, and there were many other countries in Europe where such facilities worked as well as they did in the day industrial schools. He hoped that the Government would reconsider the matter and adopt some scheme on the lines he had indicated. He quite failed to see his way to support the Amendment. It only provided that religious instruction should be given to a child if the parent desired and asked for it. What was to happen to the child whose parent did not ask for it? He presumed that if the Amendment passed, the child whose parents had failed to make known their wishes would get no religious instruction at all. If that were the case the Amendment created a purely secular basis, and unless parents were active and cared enough, and were religious enough to ask for religious instruction for their children they would not be able to get even Cowper-Temple teaching under the Amendment. Under these circumstances he could not support the Amendment, and he hoped it would be rejected. He welcomed the spirit of conciliation that was abroad and he was sincerely anxious for a settlement, but he was anxious for a settlement on really fair terms. He fully recognised the advance of Christian brotherhood in bonds of peace. They must realise that there must be variety in Christendom, but not, he hoped, disunion.

MR. LLEWELYN WILLIAMS said there was a great deal of misconception on both sides of the House as to the object and effect of this Amenmdent. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, seemed to think that if the Amendment were carried the children of drunkards and wastrels would have no religious education, because their parents were not likely to ask that such teaching should be given. But the right hon. Gentleman had apparently forgotten that unless the parent did apply that his child should receive religious instruction he could not get it as the Bill stood. In Clause 1, subsection (b) the parent must ask for religious instruction to be given. In the subsection of Clause 2, also, the parent must ask for religious teaching. So that there was really no point in what the right hon. Gentleman said with regard to the children of wastrels. His hon. friends sitting around him seemed to think that his hon. friend who had moved the Amendment was against Cowper-Temple teaching. For himself, he supported the Amendment, and he had never said a word against Cowper-Temple teaching in his life. Cowper-Temple teaching had done very well during the last thirty-eight years. What he objected to was not the character of the teaching but the fact that it was paid for out of public funds, and the object of the Amendment was to reduce Cowper-Temple teaching to the same position under the Bill as denominational teaching, namely, that it should be given in school hours by the teachers if they liked to volunteer, but that the expense of giving that Cowper-Temple teaching should fall not on the community, many of whom objected to it, or did not believe in it, but on those persons or those religious organisations who did believe in it. He had always been taught that this was the old Nonconformist and Liberal position. It was a position which had never been departed from as far as he knew except at the instance of members of the Church of England, and Nonconformists all over the country had gradually conceded, for the sake of peace, the giving of Cowper-Temple teaching in the schools, not because they wanted it, but because they were afraid, or unwilling, to pay for it out of their own pockets. They wanted to come to some sort of settlement of the religious difficulty in the schools. In Carmarthen under the Act of 1870, every school in the county was a secular school, and no religious teaching of any sort or kind was given in it. Not that religious education was not wanted. There were more scholars to-day in the Sunday schools of Wales than in the day schools, and it was absurd to say, therefore, that they were in favour of secular education because they did not care for religion. They did not have religious teaching in the schools because they did not want to have religion discredited by its being taught by people who did not believe in it. The only way to teach religion was by having it taught by people who believed in it, and who were ready to sacrifice themselves to teach to others the religion which they loved, and not because it was part of their employment, or that it helped to keep discipline in the school, or because it furthered their worldly aims. He ventured to say that no real religion could be taught by people who were inspired by such motives. It was only by people who felt deeply that which they taught that the true interests of religion and of education could be advanced. Nonconformists, unfortunately for themselves, had been lured step by step from an impregnable position for the sake of peace. He was sorry to say that hon. Gentlemen around him had now come to believe in established and endowed religion. These discussions had raised many paradoxes, and it was especially paradoxical to hear hon. Gentlemen on his side of the House speaking in favour of the establishment and endowment of one form of religion. The objection to Cowper-Temple teaching was not to its character, but to the fact that it was given in school hours; for his part he abandoned that part of his secular opinion in view of the difficulties which existed, but what he did object to was that it should be paid for out of the rates and public funds.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the question which the hon. Member was discussing did not arise on this Amendment.

Mr. LLEWELYN WILLIAMS said he was obliged to the Deputy-Chairman for letting him deal with it so far, and he would not pursue it further. He hoped that his hon. friend behind him would carry his Amendment to a division and give them this one last chance of entering their protest against the unfairness to those who did not approve of Cowper-Temple teaching, and to those who did not believe in that teaching being paid for out of public funds. He hoped that they would get the support of those who voted for a similar Amendment two years ago, and of his hon. friend the Member for West Bromwich, who was willing to die in the last ditch on the question of the right of entry, which, while other points of the Bill might be matters of expediency, was one of the vital principles. He hoped that when they got into the division lobby his hon. friend behind him would be supported not by sixty-three as the hon. Member was two years ago, but by such a phalanx of Liberals and Nonconformists, together he hoped, with gentlemen on the other side of the House who believed that Cowper-Templeism should be placed on an equality with denominational teaching in the schools, that at last they would have a solid expression of opinion from that House in favour of the only possible solution, in the long run, of this difficulty, namely, the secular solution.

Mr. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said that after what had fallen from the Attorney-General he could not refrain from saying a word or two on this important matter. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said: "Why disturb the harmony which already exists with regard to Cowper-Temple teaching in the provided schools." The fact was that they were disturbing it by this so-called bargain. They were completely upsetting the harmony which existed to-day, and that was their objection. There was only one logical way, and that was to give complete equality all round. He had been among the working classes all his life, and, though in his district they were not irreligious, he said emphatically that if they were left alone not 10 per cent. of them would ask for religious teaching of any kind in primary schools. Yet in his district they would find the Sunday schools crowded with children of the very parents who would not think of asking for religious teaching in the day schools. It was utterly impossible to settle this question by having what was called a State endowed system. It had never been endowed up to now, and why endow it now? There was no single indication that this difficulty would be any nearer settlement when this Bill went through than there had been for many years.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order. These observations are too general. They ought to be confined to the Amendment.

Mr. HUDSON said he did not want to run counter to the ruling of the Chair, and he would conclude by saying that when the hon. Member went to a division he should be very pleased to support him.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Carmarthen had appealed to his hon. friend the Member for West Bromwich as a last ditcher, and to do his hon. friend the Member for West Bromwich justice, he was the very man who would die in the last ditch for a cause. But he thought that earlier in the afternoon the hon. Member for Carmarthen was engaged in exhibiting himself rather as a hedger than as a ditcher. Being prepared to defend his own vote on a straight issue he did rather think that the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman just now was somewhat at variance with the hedger speech which he had made earlier in the day. But, in spite of that, there was a great deal of truth in what he said about Wales and education, when he stated that the Welsh might with less harm adopt the secular solution, because their Sunday schools were crowded, while England had not got her Sunday schools developed to the same extent. ["Oh."] He did not wish to appear to be over-proud of Wales, but he did think that the Sunday schools were developed to an extent in Wales that few people were prepared to argue that they were developed in England. However, he did not wish to exalt the Welsh case, which was strong enough to stand on its own merits. An hon. Member had remarked that Cowper-Templeism was a good enough religion for anybody. He understood that fundamental Christianity and Cowper-Templeism were identical; therefore, if fundamental Christianity was good enough for everybody, Cowper-Templeism was good enough for everybody. The religious feelings of other people, however, must be respected. He thought Cowper-Templeism was most admirable training, but he regarded it as general moral training and not as a religion. Let the hon. Member for Buckinghamshire ask any Roman Catholic, for instance, who held to the traditions of his Church, to the continuous discipline and dogma that had been handed down, generation after generation. Such an one would regard Cowper-Templeism as an undermining of denomination, and not as a denomination of itself. So might any member of the Anglican Church, or any other Church. It was not a position that was arguable. In this religious question they must allow each denomination and even individuals to have their views. They were not Japanese, who could send delegates round the world to decide which was the most suitable religion without any regard to the inherited traditions and feelings of generations. He thought the hon. Member was unduly dogmatic in his pronouncement upon this matter, and though Cowper-Templeism was full of merits, he held it to be a most admirable system rather corresponding with Confucianism in China as a State code of morals——

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN called the hon. Member to order.

MR. REES said he understood he was not to enter into any general remarks on the nature of Cowper-Templeism in Committee and he would of course abstain. So far as he could understand, to accept the Amendment would be to strike out the provision practically of any other form of religion but Cowper-Templeism, as a matter of course, and in the absence of a special demand by the parent. It would be to make mincemeat of this portion of the Bill, and would be altogether to deprive it of its significance. In spite of the appeal of the hon. Member for Carmarthen, who seemed very positive about it, he hoped the Amendment would have very little support. He had jotted down some notes during the speeches of other hon. Members, which were more discursive than that which he had been fortunate enough to be permitted to make, but it would be more respectful to the Chairman's ruling to make no further observations of a general character.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said the most important point which had been discussed on the Amendment was whether Cowper-Templeism was to occupy a favoured position as compared with denominational teaching. He most earnestly protested, on behalf of his constituents, against the assertion that Cowper-Temple or any other teaching should be given preference over other forms of religious instruction. It seemed to him that the only fair-minded way to approach the subject—the way which he should have thought all hon. Members who called themselves Liberals would adopt—would be to say: "If you are going to have religious teaching in the schools, all religious teaching and teachers must be put on the same footing, on a basis of equality," because if they did not do that surely it was impossible to imagine for a moment that this so-called compromise would stand. They had heard from the hon. Members for Bethnal Green and North-West Norfolk that this was only a sort of temporary settlement. They all hoped, even those who disliked the Bill in its present form, that the prophecies of these two hon. Members would not come true, but if Cowper-Temple teaching was to be endowed by the State and made a State religion, and Anglicanism, Roman Catholicism and Wesleyanism were to be made fashionable extras to be paid for by the denominations, it was absolutely impossible that this should be a permanent settlement, or that the great county of Lancashire would submit for a moment to a settlement on those lines. He asked hon. Members to consider the feelings of the managers and trustees of the thousands of voluntary schools in the single-school areas all over the country. Up to now these Church schools had been saturated with an Anglican atmosphere, though perhaps the Catechism and the Apostles Creed had been taught only one day a week, and on the other days of the week the children had been taught to become in their future lives good Church men and women. The whole object of the schools which had been built by these denominations, very often at great privations to themselves, was that their children should become of the same faith as themselves. Under this subsection they were given a right of entry on two days of the week in exchange for the five days they were giving up. These people, who were the majority of the parents, were to enter on two days of the week, and the minority, who had not spent a penny towards building the schools, were to have their own religious persuasion taught five days a week at the expense of the State. It was not fair or just, and it was impossible that a settlement could be built up on those lines. He warned hon. Members, from what he had heard from Lancashire, that if the Bill was passed in this form it would not be a reality, the schools would not be handed over without scenes of disorder, and unless they met the Anglicans and Roman Catholics in a more reasonable spirit this compromise could never stand.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said he only wanted to ask a question arising out of a statement which had startled him in the speech of the hon. Member for Carmarthen. The hon. Member said that under the Bill, in the case of a child whose parent was so apathetic or irreligious as to make no demand for any religious instruction, such a child would get no religious instruction at all. On looking through the Bill that appeared to be so. If it was true, it knocked the bottom out of the argument of the Attorney-General, and it would enlighten great masses of people in the country with regard to the real character of the Bill. Three-quarters of an hour was to be set aside for religious instruction for children whose parents desired that the child should receive that instruction. It appeared to follow that if the parent did not express his desire under those regulations, no religious instruction of any kind, Cowper-Temple or other, could be given. They ought to be informed if that was so, and, if it was not so, why not.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester) said he was one of those who felt that the spirit permeating this Bill was of profound importance, and would have a great deal of effect in tempering the attitude of the persons who would have to carry it out on the whole question of religion. He was extremely sorry to find moved by his hon. friend an Amendment which seemed to make for the secularism of the school. He would be glad to be corrected if he was mistaken. As he read the Amendment it made out that only in those cases where a child's parents asked for religious teaching it should be the duty of the authority to give it. He felt that owing to the action of the closure they had not an opportunity for discussing the provisions of the clause, and it had now come to this, that if the first clause became operative they would have to apply for any religious teaching, however small its quantity, or they would get none.

Sir W. J. COLLINS: That does not arise in consequence of my Amendment. It may be so in the Bill as it is drafted.

Mr. ESSEX said fearlessly that if it went out to the country that the Bill laid it down as a cardinal principle that only those parents who were industrious enough to ask for some religious instruction would have the satisfaction of knowing that their children had it, the Bill was doomed to failure. Every man amongst them was moved by a desire that his child should be taught in the day schools of the country the underlying principles of morality to which not a man of them did not pay honour. He wanted to break a light lance with the hon. Member for Blackpool. The hon. Member, like a good many more, hurt the feelings of simple-minded Nonconformists like himself when he suggested that this, which they hoped and begged must be the irreducible minimum of teaching in the schools, Cowper-Temple teaching, was the religion of the Nonconformist. Emphatically that was not so. But the hon. Member for Blackpool placed it in direct competition and contrast with Anglicanism, Roman Catholicism, and Wesleyanism. Cowper-Templeism, which they wanted to be the normal irreducible minimum, was what they, as Nonconformists, conceded to their Church friends, hoping they could at least agree upon that, that the children might understand in that and be taught in that all that their intellects at the time of elementary education were capable of assimilating, and that when they began to branch off from that common basis of simple elements into Roman Catholicism or Wesleyanism, into the creed of the Baptist, the Unitarian, and the rest, they had arrived at a time when the children were no longer in the schools. In short, they could understand the common basis, but when the time came for differentiation between the various colours and textures of these more developed creeds based upon that common basis they had left school. If he was right in that, his hon. friends ought to support this Amendment. There were in his own division eighty single-school areas. He believed that the majority of them desired some religious teaching, but many of the parents would hesitate before taking upon themselves the choosing or indicating of the exact formula or syllabus of religious instruction they required for their children. If he had been in the House of Commons six or eight years ago he would have been found supporting the hon. Member for Burnley in his secular solution, but he would not dare to do that to-day with his knowledge of rural divisions. He had had all his own children educated by Church people, and, Nonconformist as he was, he would sooner have his children educated by Roman Catholics than have them go without any religious education at all, He hoped his Roman Catholic friends would move along those lines.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil) pointed out that if this Amendment were carried, it would merely be a repetition of the First Lord's Amendment.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) hoped the President of the Board of Education would give them an answer to the questions put to him. It certainly seemed to him that the hon. Member who spoke last had expressed the true view of the Amendment. He would like to know whether it was the fact that no child would receive religious instruction in the school unless the parent expressed a wish that it should receive such instruction. The clause really ought to be amended so as to read in the negative, and the child ought to receive the religious instruction unless the parent expressed a desire in the opposite direction.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he had already explained that it was the intention of the Government to leave Cowper-Temple teaching in exactly the same position in which it now was. In all the provided schools of the country Cowper-Temple teaching was given to the children in the school with the exception of those whose parents desired that they should be withdrawn. It was the intention of the Government not to alter the provision of religious teaching in so far as that was concerned.

MR. ASHLEY asked what the position of denominational instruction would be.

MR. RUNCIMAN said the child would not get specific religious instruction if the parent did not ask for it. The child would get Cowper-Temple teaching unless the parent asked that the child should be withdrawn. That teaching really did not supersede, or run in antagonism to, or in any way prevent, purely denominational instruction. When they talked about Cowper-Temple instruction they ought to remember that in the non-provided schools it was the same kind of religious instruction as that which was given on four days of the week, and it was of such a kind as not to prevent its being made a foundation for a superstructure of purely denominational instruction.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he only rose to make sure that he understood the position as it had just been declared by the President of the Board of Education. He understood it was the intention of the Government that the normal instruction to every child whose parents expressed no wish one way or the other should be what was called Cowper-Temple teaching, but a parent might express a wish that his child should have no religious teaching at all. He took it if, on looking into Clause 1, the Government found the wording did not carry out that intention, they would themselves put down Amendments on the Report-stage making it clear.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Yes, it is our intention to make that quite clear.

*MR. P. BARLOW (Bedford) said his hon. friend had appealed to those who voted against the right of entry to support the Amendment. He could not imagine on what possible grounds that appeal could be made, because it seemed to him that the result of the Amendment would be not to limit the right of entry, but to extend it to five days a week, and also to extend denominational instruction to every child on every one of those five days a week. This was supposed to be an agreed Bill, and the majority of Nonconformists had endeavoured to take a broad and open view of the situation. They had consented to support the compromise because of its being a possible agreement upon a question which had so long disturbed the education of the country. The two days right of entry was one of the points upon which they found it most difficult to support the

Bill. He stood in the position of having put this very point before two public meetings in his constituency, and so far from finding any objection either from Nonconformists or Churchmen, he had to say to the Committee that he did not hear at either of those meetings one single word in condemnation of the Bill as a whole. The opinion was that they desired a settlement to be arrived at as soon as possible, and they believed that this measure provided a basis of settlement which would put an end to this disastrous controversy, and they agreed with him in supporting the Government in their effort to bring this compromise to a satisfactory conclusion.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) said he was not quite satisfied with the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill in regard to undenominational teaching. Was he right in assuming that the sole difference between undenominational teaching, as given at present in the council schools, and as it would be given under the Bill, was that whereas under the existing state of things a council might in its discretion decline to give any religious instruction at all, under the Bill the council would be deprived of that discretion, and would be compelled to give the religious instruction? That was his first point. His second was in regard to the right of entry. He would like to know whether, if a parent belonging to any denomination whatsoever desired that his child should be given instruction in the tenets of that denomination, facilities must be provided. He was not quite certain whether that was to be an absolute right, or a right qualified by considerations of convenience as determined by the local authority or the religious instruction committee. For instance, had a Mahomedan parent the right to demand special instruction for his child in that religion? He was in a great difficulty about this point, because he did not know whether the right was absolute, or whether the council or religious instruction committee had a right to say who should or should not give such instruction. He presumed that a teacher of the Church of England would be perfectly entitled to teach the children of members of the Church of England the doctrines contained in the thirty-nine Articles. He supposed it would be quite in order for such a teacher to teach the doctrine of the thirty-eighth Article. If a teacher of the Church of England could go into a school and teach the particular doctrines of that Church, would it be open to the members of the Socialist group, for example, to claim the right——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the Committee having decided on the Amendment to leave out subsection (1) of this clause that religious instruction was to be given and that facilities were to be provided for such instruction, hon. Members must now confine themselves to the specific Amendment before the Committee.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said if that was so he must accept the ruling, but it was very important to know exactly what was proposed before one was called upon to vote on this particular provision which involved the right of entry.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: May I point out that by rejecting the Amendment to leave out subsection (1) the Committee has already decided the principle of the right to receive religious instruction, of a character different from that to be given under Clause 1 (2) (*b*) and also the duty of the local education authority to provide accommodation for such religious instruction. The Committee is now only dealing with matters of detail to carry out that principle, and cannot go back on the principle which has been determined by that vote.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said that was precisely what he understood. He thought they had now a right to discuss the details and ascertain from the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill precisely what the proposal involved.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: These details the hon. Member refers to will fall to be discussed under subsection (6).

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS called attention to the words proposed to be left out, and said that they all knew what was the character of the religious instruction to be given under the Education Act of 1870. What he was not sure about was the precise character of the religious instruction which might be given under this Bill.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: That question arose on the proposal to leave out the subsection.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said that they only decided the general principle on the question to leave out the subsection. Here they were discussing a very important point of detail. He was anxious that no undue time should be occupied in discussing these matters, but they were really of vital importance. It had been represented to him that day that clergymen of the Church of England, who, having acted illegally, would be prohibited from teaching if the Report of the Ecclesiastical Commission were carried into effect, might be allowed to go and teach in the schools. He wished to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether that was so or not. He had the impression from what the right hon. Gentleman said at a meeting of Nonconformists in the early stages of the negotiations that it was intended strictly to limit the right of entry to denominations to two days a week.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: That comes under subsection (2).

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said he would not trespass further on that point. He desired to say that local authorities with experience in the administration of education had very considerable objection to the right of entry. He would like to call the attention of the Committee to an important resolution which was passed.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The duty of the local education authority in this matter is provided for in subsection (6).

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said he would not press his point beyond reading the Resolution. It was passed at Llandrindod Wells some time ago and affected the whole Welsh community,

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I do not see what that has to do with the present Amendment. I have repeatedly called the hon. Member to order.

*MR. MADDISON (Burnley) said the Amendment raised a clear issue, whether Cowper-Temple teaching and denominational teaching should be put on an equal footing out of school hours. He regretted that the hon. Member for Gloucester should again, after repeated protests and repudiations, speak of his hon. friend the Member for St. Pancras as endeavouring to enforce secularism. This was no effort of organised secularists to keep their activities confined to affairs of this world without recognising a life beyond. It was unfair to those who supported the secular solution of the education question that they should be constantly obliged to make these protests. What they desired by the Amendment was to keep the school period altogether clear from the entanglement, embarrassment, and bickering that followed the giving of religious instruction as part of the curriculum.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The Committee has already decided by the vote to leave out subsection (1) that religious instruction is to be given.

*MR. MADDISON said that if this Amendment was in order at all, it was surely competent for him to say that the instruction should be given outside of the school hours altogether.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The subsection as amended, if this Amendment were carried, would still provide for religious instruction being given. The Amendment would not have been in order otherwise, because it would have been antagonistic to the decision of the Committee. The time within which such religious instruction might be given would arise later under subsection (2).

MR. MADDISON said the hon. Member for West St. Pancras would probably consult the convenience of the House by not going to a division on the Amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Lord R. CECIL moved to amend the clause by omitting the words "it is open to the local education authority to give in accordance with subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870," and inserting in their place the words "the local authority gives, or proposes to give in such school." He thought the Amendment was one which the Government might accept. It was really an improvement on the drafting of the Bill, and made quite clear what the subsection actually meant. The clause, as it stood, gave the parent the right to demand special religious instruction provided that he demanded instruction—

> "Of a character different from that which it is open to the local education authority to give, in accordance with subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870."

That was to say, the parent was to get for his child the religious instruction demanded and which was incapable of being given under the Cowper-Temple clause. He did not think that the Government could mean that. He did not believe it had ever been decided how far they could give denominational instruction under the Cowper-Temple clause. What would happen if the parent was not satisfied with what was known as the London County Council syllabus or with the instruction ordinarily given in the school which his child attended under the Cowper-Temple clause? He ventured to think that some such words as he proposed in his Amendment would be an improvement on the drafting of the Bill; would describe the intention of the Government better than those used in the clause; and would, to some extent, further the execution of the wishes of those parents who genuinely objected to the instruction ordinarily given in the schools. He could not think that the Government would object to the principle of the Amendment, and he hoped that they would so far meet him as to accept it. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 22, to leave out from the word 'which' to the second word 'the,' in line 24, and to insert the words 'the local education authority gives or proposes to give in such school.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part."

Sir W. ROBSON said that he hoped to convince the noble Lord that the words in the Bill were the best to carry out the purpose intended. This was not merely a question of drafting, but a question of substance. As the Bill stood, a local authority might give Cowper-Temple instruction, or permit the right of entry in order that a particular kind of instruction might be given. It might be that some parents would say that they did not want Anglican instruction, Catholic instruction, or any denominational instruction for their children; that they were quite content with Cowper-Temple instruction, but that they did not want the particular Cowper-Temple instruction which was given in that particular school. The effect of this clause would be to enable the local authorities to decline to meet such a request. A demand for a particular kind of denominational instruction could be made under the Bill; but the measure did not permit, so far as Cowper-Templeism itself was concerned, the parents to analyse and divide it so that they could demand a large number of different kinds of religious instruction being given. There must be a certain degree of generality observed with regard to Cowper-Temple instruction. To have such a variety might lead to so many class-rooms being occupied for different kinds of Cowper-Temple instruction, that the working of the right of entry would be interfered with.

Sir PHILIP MAGNUS asked whether the Bill contained any definition of Cowper-Templeism.

Sir W. ROBSON said that the Bill did not assume to define it. The phrase was very well understood; and he did not think it would be very desirable to define it in the Bill.

Mr. JAMES HOPE said he would like to have a clear understanding on this point. Supposing they had a local authority giving Cowper-Temple instruction in the simple form of Bible-reading and that some parents were dissatisfied with it, saying that they wanted the Apostles' Creed, or the Ten Commandments taught; would it or would it not be competent for the parents to go a little further and ask for the teaching of some catechism or some form of religious teaching common to many denominations ?

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Will the hon. Member say whether the Ten Commandments are in the Bible or not ?

MR. JAMES HOPE : Yes.

MR. CROOKS: One would imagine they were not from what some hon. Members said.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) asked the hon. and learned Gentleman to elucidate the conditions under which this clause could be applied where, in a school in a large borough, Cowper-Temple teaching took the form of reading passages of Scripture without note or comment. If a denominational school in that borough were to pass over to the local education authority, would that local education authority be allowed to set up Cowper-Temple teaching according to their own ideas ? If so, the result would be that there would be only a reading of passages of Scripture, but no questions would be permitted to be asked by the pupils and no explanation given by the teacher.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: How does the hon. Member connect that with the Amendment before the Committee ?

MR. CARLILE said that they were surely entitled to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman how this clause in the Bill would be worked. Apparently it would result in Church children getting no religious instruction except in two days in the week.

LORD R. CECIL said that what the answer of the Attorney-General came to was that all the boasted security, on which certain well-meaning people had built their support of the Bill, that there should be some Bible teaching in the school was absolutely non-existent. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] There was nothing to prevent the education authority giving any kind of religious or non-religious instruction, but if some undenominational parents went to the education authority and said: "We do not desire to be put under the sectarian heel of the clergy of any denomination, but we do desire simple Bible teaching, the elements of Christianity," the local education authority would be bound to reply: "We cannot meet your wishes at all. You can, if you say you are Church of England or Roman Catholic, have special religious instruction, but if you merely want the elements of the Christian faith, you cannot have it." He was quite ready to withdraw his Amendment, but he hoped hon. Members who supported the Bill would observe what was the result of this legislation.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said that this Amendment raised a very important point indeed. In the Preston case it was expressly held that the Athanasian Creed might be lawfully taught under the 1870 Act, and under the Cockerton judgment——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The Amendment does not raise that question at all. Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the Amendment be withdrawn ?

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS thought he would not be out of order if he asked a definite expression of opinion on this point from the Attorney-General.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: A question cannot be asked relating to a matter outside the scope of the Amendment.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that it was quite a common case that the local authority might decide that Cowper-Temple teaching amounted only to reading the Bible and looking up difficult words in the dictionary. But supposing a considerable number of parents wanted more——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Amendment, which simply proposes to leave out certain descriptive or contrasting words in the clause, and substitute other words. As the clause stands it provides for a child receiving religious instruction of a character different from that which "it is open to the local education authority to give in accordance with subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Act, 1870." The Amendment is to leave out those descriptive words and to substitute the words "the local authority gives or proposes to give in such school. The religious instruction to be given by the local authority is already defined under Clause 1 (2) (*b*) as "(not being in contravention of subsection (2) of Section 14 of the Act of 1870)," and the merits of that religion are not open to re-discussion.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he thought the Chairman was assuming that Cowper-Temple teaching was necessarily all of one sort. He submitted that so long as catechisms and formularies were not used the teaching given under the Cowper-Temple clause might be entirely denominational. The Amendment pointed out that the parent might object to one sort of Cowper-Temple teaching when he might not object to another. That was a substantial distinction.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that that was so, but such a question would have to be raised under Clause 1. The present Amendment dealt with the substitution of certain words for those in the Bill and the propriety of such substitution.

MR. BRIDGEMAN said, with respect, that he was not raising a general question, but the special question of the very words of the Amendment. He said that in many schools the local authority gave what would come under the Cowper-Temple clause, but which was merely reading the Bible and picking out the difficult words in the dictionary. That was a totally different thing from what was regarded by hon. Members opposite as simple Bible teaching under the Cowper-Temple clause, and which the Minister for Education said was actually given three days a week already in nearly all the voluntary schools. Supposing a large number of parents said they wanted Cowper-Temple teaching without formulæ and without creeds, but that they did not think it was any good merely having the Bible read and not explained at all, they were entirely excluded from any choice for their children unless they accepted teaching which went a great deal further than what they liked. That seemed to him to be a gross injustice.

SIR W. ROBSON said that undoubtedly the parents who desired Cowper-Temple teaching must take the Cowper-Temple teaching provided by the local authority; if they desired a different kind of Cowper-Temple teaching they must operate through the local authority; they must change the local authority. He was quite sure that hon. Members opposite would not desire that every parent should dictate to the local authority the precise form of Cowper-Temple teaching, or require, if the local authority did not meet his wishes, that he should have special accommodation provided for him as though he represented a different denomination. To give that right to the parents would very seriously hamper the facilities available. He thought the words of the Bill were those which were the best calculated to avoid possible difficulties.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS asked, if the remedy when parents were dissatisfied with the particular form of Cowper-Temple teaching given was to change the local authority, how he proposed it could be done in the case of the non-elective religious instruction committee.

SIR W. ROBSON said the hon. Member had put the question of electoral contingencies, which was hardly relevant to the point before them.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil) said he regretted he could not put his Amendment on the Paper, owing to the great hurry in which the Bill had been brought forward. The Amendment was very simple in form, if far-reaching in character. It was to leave out the word "shall" and insert the word "may," so as to leave the discretion to the local authority as to whether they should provide accommodation for special religious instruction or not. The Government claimed that they had never deviated from the two fundamental principles upon which their policy was based—the one being popular control in all State-aided schools, and the other no tests for teachers. He maintained that in this clause they had offended grievously against both these principles. As to the first, they had already, in the name of popular control, taken away the discretion of the local authority, which they always hitherto possessed, as to whether they would give Cowper-Temple teaching or not, and now they went a step further and insisted that the local authorities should, whether they liked it or not, give sectarian teaching. At present, in the council schools, in which after all the bulk of the children of this country were educated, there was no teaching of this kind at all; but under the Bill, in the name of popular control, the Government insisted that the local authorities should give it, whether they liked it or not. He hoped that even now the Government might see their way to comply with his proposal, so that their claim that they had never deviated from the principle of popular control should be well founded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, to leave out the word 'shall,' and insert the word 'may.'"—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the clause."

MR. RUNCIMAN said his hon. friend had contended that the clause provided that the local education authority should give sectarian teaching, but he would like to point out that it provided nothing of the kind. It merely conferred facilities for other people to give such teaching under certain conditions. That was the very essence of the sub-clause, and of course he could not depart from it, as the hon. Member well knew.

*MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) said he would like to support the Amendment. He did not vote in favour of the Second Reading, nor did he vote against it. He voted against compulsory undenominational teaching in Clause 1 and against compulsory denominational teaching in Clause 2, and in that way he had done his best to preserve the equipoise arrived at. He knew that the right of entry, as it was called, was a very grave educational evil, and he was one of those who regarded the interests of education as far more important than the religious wranglings which had occupied the House in discussing this and other Bills. Anyone who had had experience of education—and he had served for three years on the Education Committee of the London County Council—not only knew that the right of entry was an intolerable nuisance, but also that the parents cared very little about it. A compromise had been arrived at between what the Leader of the Opposition had described as the high contracting parties; he did not know who they were, but he knew that that was the language appropriate to international law in the case of the sovereigns of independent States, and it seemed to him a description singularly inapplicable to the parties to this so-called compromise. He would rather liken the contending forces to two rival commercial houses who had been endeavouring for many years to supply the entire public demand. Having failed to get that, they had arrived at a compromise, or, as he would rather call it, in trade terms, a combine. Now the essence of the combine was this, that in order to regulate competition and to reduce working expenses and diminish friction, each firm should have the opportunity of supplying its own brand to certain classes of customers. As happened in most combines, the customer had not been consulted at all. The customer in this case was the parent, and the parent did not care a rap, generally speaking, which of the particular brands was pushed upon him, and he resented, unless he was to poor too resent anything, having a particular kind of religion pushed upon him by the solicitations of parsons or other ecclesiastical bagmen. While it was quite possible for a cleric or a busybody among the laymen to stir up the parent in a particular area and induce him to send in such a request as was specified in this clause, it remained the fact, and they all knew it, that the parent did not care a jot about the whole business. They were imposing by this clause on the local authority the obligation to supply any brand of religion which any busybody might induce any parent to demand. He could not describe the proposal as anything less than foolishness. He welcomed this Amendment to restrict the area. If carried, it would leave it open to the local authorities to decide whether they would or would not supply that denominational education which everybody knew was very little required by the parents and the supply of which would disturb and upset the administration of the school. He had pleasure in seconding the Amendment.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS, in support of the Amendment, said that the people of Wales believed in the principle of local option, and although they had not succeeded in getting it in another Bill which had passed this House, that was no reason why they should not attempt to obtain it in this Bill. The Church Congress of Wales had taken a definite stand upon this matter. At a conference called to consider what amendments should be made to the Act of 1902, they carried a resolution unanimously to accept no amendment to the Education Act which did not prevent the right of entry for sectarian teaching during school hours. Upon that official and definite declaration of the Church Congress of Wales he took his stand. It represented the real spirit and desire of the Welsh people in a way which had not been presented by the majority of the Welsh Party in this House.

MR. CARLILE opposed the Amendment. He thought from the speeches of the three Members who had supported it that it was not the intention of many people that the provisions of this Bill should be made real. If these rules were illusory, and the local authorities were allowed to put all sorts of difficulties in the way of this instruction being given, and no machinery was put into the Bill to prevent them, then the concession was worthless. He regretted that that tone should be taken up by Members opposite, as it was quite inconsistent with what the Prime Minister and other Ministers had said, and confirmed the impression among those with whom he sat that it was not intended that these things should be real, but, on the contrary, that they should be sapped, undermined, and made absolutely worthless.

*MR. ADKINS said that he, for one, intended to be perfectly loyal to the right of entry given in the clause and he protested against the suggestions of the last speaker which were quite unjustified. If the matter were left to local option, it would facilitate the worst kind of controversy in the election of local authorities. Those who had had to do with local work were most anxious that administration should be as free as possible from acute controversial matter. If the right of entry was part of the settlement to be carried out in good faith and feeling, it was surely better that it should be statutory so that people concerned might know their obligations.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 282; Noes, 18. (Division List No. 425.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, RtHn. Sir Alex. F
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burt. Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cave, George
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Gulland, John W.
Haddock, George B.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmsley, Viscount
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Houston, Robert Paterson
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Laidlaw, Hobert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Rt Hn. Sir C. B. (Leices.
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willians
Nuttall, Harry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rendall, Athelstan
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel Rt. Hn. H. L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin

Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winterton, Earl
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Cooper, G. J.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Doughty, Sir George
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Kekewich, Sir George
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Macpherson, J. T.
Radford, G. H.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Snowden, P.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. D. A. Thomas and Mr. Clement Edwards.

*MR. CAVE said the Amendment he wished to move had to be read in conjunction with a consequential Amendment later on the Paper. The effect of the two together would be that, when a proper demand for special religious instruction was made, the authority would be bound to provide suitable accommodation for the child to receive that instruction on two mornings in the week. He did not speak as a supporter of the Bill. He did not vote for the Second Reading, and he could not possibly vote for the Bill in its present shape; but, in common with other Members, he was watching to see whether the Government carried out their declaration, and made the right of entry a reality. This was one of several Amendments put down on the Paper to enable the Government to carry out that declaration. The Bill at present provided that, when a parent desired that his child should receive special religious instruction, the authority should make available any accommodation in the schoolhouse which could reasonably be made so available. They had, however, to read those words in connection with subsection (6) of this clause. That subsection provided that, in considering whether accommodation was available, the authority should take into account a number of circumstances. There were no less than four different matters which the authority were required to take into account, viz., the number of children or groups of children requiring religious instruction, the proportion of those children in each case to the total number of children in the school, the number of persons available to give that instruction, and the manner in which the classrooms in the schoolhouse could be most conveniently and advantageously used. There were, therefore, under the Bill as it stood any number of objections which might be raised to the demand for special religious instruction. It would be perfectly easy for a reluctant authority, acting no doubt in a *bona fide* manner, to find within the four corners of the clause many reasons for not providing accommodation for special religious instruction. He wanted to make that impossible. He did not want the giving of special religious instruction to be conditional on a number of matters which the authority might decide one way or the other. He wanted it made imperative upon the authority to provide accommodation. He had put down an Amendment for that purpose so that, when the demand was made in proper form, the authority should be required to provide suitable accommodation for the purpose. He had only heard one objection to this proposal, and that was that the effect of the words might be that the authority might have to build and add to their premises. He did not think that would arise. If there was room in the school for the giving of secular instruction, surely it would be possible by a little goodwill on the part of the authorities to find room for the giving of the different kinds of religious instruction. He would not object to a reasonable minimum to the number of parents requiring special religious instruction so that they should not have a demand for one or two children; but he felt sure that with a little goodwill it would always be possible to find room He moved his Amendment with the genuine intention of having it embodied in the Bill if possible. He thought it pointed out a real danger in the way of the smooth working of the Bill, and he hoped either it or something of equivalent value would be given.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'provide suitable accommodation.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. RUNCIMAN said the hon. and learned Member had pointed out a very serious flaw in his own Amendment. It put on the authority the obligation to erect special premises if it could not provide accommodation in the existing premises for denominational instruction. The same point arose earlier in the afternoon, and in a conversation across the floor of the House, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcester obtained a statement from the Prime Minister to the effect that in so far as any difficulty arose under the subsection they would do their best to remove it. The right hon. Gentleman had provided him with a copy of his suggested Amendment, and he thought it would cover the hon. and learned Member's point, whilst it would not put on the authority the obligation to erect new premises, which, he presumed, the hon. and learned Member would not put forward. The subsection, if the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman were incorporated, would read as follows: "The authority shall, for the purpose of enabling that child to receive that instruction on two mornings in the week, make suitable accommodation in the schoolhouse available, unless they satisfy the Board of Education that that accommodation cannot reasonably be so made available without making structural alerations or additions to the schoolhouse." The Government had considered the Amendment carefully and would be prepared to accept it. It would, he thought, do all the hon. and learned Member desired in the proposal he made.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that, as his hon. friend the Member for Marylebone observed at an earlier stage, he could make no claim to speak for anyone but himself. He thought that he was in the same position as most hon. Members in that respect. He was much obliged to the Government for the way in which they had met him. It appeared to him that the clause as it stood put all the onus of proving that accommodation was available on the parent who desired special religious instruction for his child. He wished to transfer the onus of proof on to the authority that there was not such accommodation, and that was what the Amendment which the Government had consented to accept did. That was a substantial concession, for which he was grateful to the Government. They recognised that it was the duty of the local authority to provide this accommodation if it possibly could without having to erect new buildings; and it placed upon them the obligation, if they refused to provide the accommodation, of proving that their refusal arose out of their inability to make suitable accommodation. He wished to make one other observation, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not think him ungenerous after the way in which he had met him. He agreed that this subsection had to be read in connection with subsection (6). He had read subsection (6) very carefully, and it did, he thought, complicate the matter; but he did not agree with his hon. and learned friend that the object ot the subsection was to throw obstacles in the way of parents. He took it the intention was rather in the opposite direction, and that it was meant to give better security against unnecessary obstacles being placed in the way of parents exercising their rights. He hoped they might reach that subsection in time to discuss it, because he thought it was very important they should do so. He believed if they did, they would come to something like a general agreement. In accepting, so far as he was concerned, the concession the Government had made on subsection (1) they ought not to be precluded from raising the same question on subsection (6) when they came to it.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said that if this alteration was made there ought to be some limitation as to the number of children for whom accommodation was made. The number thirty had been suggested, but most of them thought that was too many. It had been pointed out by a Liberal friend of his that if every parent chose to demand special instruction for his own child, that might be made a means of wrecking the right of entry. It had also been suggested that this might be a possible means for hostile local authorities to wreck the Bill. He did not suggest that such a thing would be done, but in order to remove the possibility of its being attempted, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the possibility of putting in some such limitation, and thus make it very much easier for them to believe that this was really a genuine concession to those who desired denominational teaching.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said if, as he understood, the Government were going to propose alternative words, it was very important that they should have them.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said that when they came to the Amendment which would be proposed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, they might discuss it. The only purpose he had in reading it was to show that they had in mind the point raised, and that they could not accept the Amendment.

*Mr. CAVE asked what would be the effect on subsection (6) if the Amendment was accepted in lieu of this one. If they were taking away the decision on this question from the authority and transferring it to the Board of Education, they did not want the words in subsection (6), line 33, because they simply supplied a guide to local authorities. Would it not be consequential on his right hon. friend's Amendment to leave out the words in subsection (6), to which he took some objection?

Mr. RUNCIMAN said it did not necessarily follow, and he did not think they could discuss subsection (6) on this

Amendment. He would rather leave it to a later stage, when he thought he could show the hon. Member that it was in the interest of his friends. It was framed with that intention.

MR. LOUGH thought it would be more convenient if they could make an observation or two when the words were actually before them, but they had to remember the way the discussion went on, and perhaps they would never be before them. Would the right hon. Gentleman set them the example of making a suggestion as to what he would agree to with regard to this clause, and just say one word about it now? He suggested that while he could not accept these words throwing an absolute obligation on the local authority to make provision, he would go so far as to see that if they did not make accommodation available it should be left to the Board of Education to decide whether the local education authority had come to its conclusion fairly or not. In short, the matter would be left to the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman might well consider whether that was not throwing a very invidious duty on the Board of Education. These local authorities had not been treated very well up to the present. No option whatever was left to them, and as the clause was drawn it read: "They shall if it is reasonably practicable." These words seemed to go quite far enough. But they were going now to subject them to a trial, and if they said it was not reasonably practicable, they were going to haul them up to London before the Board of Education. That was treating these authorities rather hardly. The Committee ought to consider how the Board of Education would be able to decide this question. It would have to send down an inspector at great expense to hear evidence on both sides, and then to perform one of those duties which tempted the Board of Education into political by-paths. One Board would decide one way, and the next another. Their decisions would be very much an open question. He was glad the Amendment was not to be accepted.

MR. CAVE: After what has happened I ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD R. CECIL said the Amendment which he rose to move was one of considerable importance. Its object was to provide that except where conditions were expressly varied by the Act the conditions of denominational instruction should be the same as the conditions of undenominational instruction. It was of some importance in the practical working of this matter. For instance, children whose parents desired that they should receive denominational instruction might say: "Oh, no; we are not going in, we are going to play in the playground or the street." There was nothing in the Bill, as it stood, giving the master any disciplinary authority over the scholars in this connection. There was nothing that made the instruction any part of the ordinary curriculum of the school. All the clause said was that the local education authority were bound to provide accommodation. That was the whole obligation, and the only power given to the parents to obtain the instruction. He was not asking anything unreasonable when he asked that all the conditions that applied to the ordinary curriculum of the school, the discipline to be exercised by the master, the furniture of the school—all that kind of question should be the same as if the denominational instruction were undenominational. They were very anxious, where the authorities were hostile, that the matter should not be put on one side as a matter of no importance and an extra which the law compelled them to carry out, and which they might carry out in as perfunctory a way as possible. They were anxious that it should be a real thing, and he understood the Government wished that too. This would be a real advance towards making the right of entry effective.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'instruction,' to insert the words 'upon the same conditions, save as in this Act mentioned, as any other religious instruction given in the school.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. ROBSON, who was indistinctly heard, thought the words of the Amendment were a little too general. The noble Lord said the discipline of the school ought to be applied to the children while they were receiving the special religious instruction. Obviously it should, and he thought that was already provided for in the clause. The special religious instruction would undoubtedly be given between the hours to which the bye-laws applied, and even though in extreme cases it was not given between such hours, it would still be part of the instruction of the school. However, it might well be said more expressly that the children should be made subject to the discipline of the school during the special religious instruction. There would be a little danger in going much further. Supposing the whole special religious instruction was placed unde the school discipline, it might have the effect of placing the clergyman who gave the religious instruction under the schoolmaster. Whatever provision was made, it must be in a better form of language. If they specified that religious instruction should be on the time-table they met all reasonable requirements.

Lord R. CECIL considered that the Attorney-General had met his point very fairly, but he asked him not to close his mind to the possibility of adopting such words as he had suggested. The difficulties of drafting, he was aware, had been very extreme, but he hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would consider the possibility of adopting more general words, because it would be intensely valuable in the case of any difficulty arising to be able to say to any local authority: "You are not treating these children in the same way as other children," and they would be able to say to the local authority that it was not doing its duty.

Sir W. ROBSON replied that the Government had considered the point and had decided upon a form of words which would shortly appear on the Paper, making the intention clear.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. JAMES HOPE moved to insert after the word "instruction" the words "in a class of reasonable size." He did not think all the children requiring special instruction should be lumped together and given their instruction in a perfunctory way. He wished to secure that the instruction should be given under the best educational conditions, and among those conditions he thought a reasonably small class was one of the most important.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'instruction,' to insert the words 'in a class of reasonable size.'"—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. RUNCIMAN assured the hon. Member that the proposal he had made was fully met in subsection (6) and it was quite unnecessary to insert those words at this point.

LORD R. CECIL did not quite agree that this point was met in subsection (6) which was rather a different matter. His hon. friend wished to provide that the local education authority should provide accommodation for special instruction "in a class of reasonable size." Subsection (6) provided that they were not to provide any accommodation at all unless certain conditions were fulfilled. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to meet the point raised by his hon. friend.

MR. JAMES HOPE could not agree that his point had been met, but he would content himself with having called attention to the matter, which might perhaps be raised later on.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes) moved to omit the words "on two mornings in the week on which the school meets." He understood from what had been said earlier in the debate that the right of entry would not be restricted to two mornings in the week, but that an individual child would not have an opportunity to receive denominational instruction on more than two mornings in the week. That was a very grudging allowance, and once it was conceded that those who attended the school to give denominational teaching could be present in the schools on more than two mornings weekly, what could be said, even from the strictly undenominational point of view, against granting permission to the children to receive, on more than two mornings in the week, that religious instruction which their parents wished them to receive? There was much to be said on behalt of the parents who conscientiously urged that plea. He had never strongly upheld the denominational point of view, and he supported the Second Reading because he desired to see some settlement of their religious difficulties brought about. He voted for the Second Reading because it always seemed to him that the more they discussed these matters the greater chance there would be of understanding each other and appreciating the depth of each others religious convictions. He had an opinion that religious teaching under the Cowper-Temple clause was valuable as far as it went. But as the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone had said upon a former stage of this Bill, no one could call such religious teaching as he had in mind non-doctrinal. Although he was of opinion that religious instruction of value to the children could be imparted and in some schools was imparted under the Cowper-Temple clause, at the same time he did not ignore the fact which they had all to acknowledge and recognise that there a large body of people who took an opposite view, and who believed that such teaching, if not harmful, was absolutely worthless. They had a perfect right to hold that view, and he was certain it was honestly held, and no man had any right to dictate his views to another in this connection. Those were matters between a man and his own conscience, or perhaps he should say between a man and his Maker. When they heard some hon. Members opposite say that the teaching under the Cowper-Temple clause ought to satisfy all Protestants, he had no hesitation in declaring that the House of Commons had no right to dictate what should be the views of any in regard to the religious teaching to be given to their children. If they were to have a lasting settlement they must bear in mind a fact of very great importance in connection with the right of entry. What had Nonconformists complained of with regard to their position under the Bill of 1902? What had impelled them to passive resistance? It was that they had been compelled to pay for a religious education of which they did not approve. How did they propose under this Bill to remedy that state of things? They proposed to do it by shifting this very same grievance, which by their own admission had been intolerable to them in the past, on to the backs of others. They proposed to compel others to pay for a religious education of which those others disapproved. That was a fact which he asked hon. Gentlemen opposite not to forget. When they said this was not a balanced settlement, and that very small surrenders were required from the Church, he asked them to recall the violent terms in which they characterised some time since the bondage which they now, under this Bill, were seeking to impose upon others. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Question."] How could anyone with any sense of justice be prepared to consider the possibility of carrying into law so obviously unjust a provision as this? It was only because they hoped that the *quid pro quo*, which was the right of entry into all schools, would be no shadowy concession, but would be really valuable and substantial in its nature. Right of entry was of no use to Roman Catholics, and it was no use in the Roman Catholic schools in the single school areas, of which he had an example in his own constituency. The parents of those Roman Catholic schools in single districts would in future be——

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

ASSIZES AND QUARTER SESSIONS BILL [LORDS].

Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease*).

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES, No. 31 (1908).

Accessions of British Colonies, etc., to the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria; signed at Sofia, 9th December, 1905. (*See* Treaty Series, No. 1. (1908).)

FOREIGN IMPORT DUTIES, 1908.

Statement of the rates of import duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Mexico, Argentina, Japan, China, and Persia, upon the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Orders permitting the landing of animals—

No. 7,608 (dated 24th November, 1908) at Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf (ss. "Crown Point").

No. 7,608 (dated 24th November, 1908) at Birkenhead Foreign Animals Wharf (ss. "Armenian").

No. 7,610 (dated 25th November, 1908) at Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf (ss. "Minneapolis").

No. 7,611 (dated 25th November, 1908) at a foreign animals wharf in Great Britain (ss. "Manchester Trader").

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS, 1894 TO 1906.

Order in Council, dated 21st November, 1908, exempting German ships when in British ports from the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, relating to overloading upon certain conditions.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.

Six Orders in Council under the Act.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) ACT, 1907.

Public Health (Foreign Meat) Regulations (Scotland), 1908. Public Health (First Series, Unsound Food) Regulations (Scotland), 1908.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906.

Workmen's Compensation Rules, 1908, (No. 2), dated 24th November, 1908.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Licence granted by His Majesty to Emma Byron, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Lady Henry Somerset Home, Duxhurst, Reigate.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Report from the Select Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee and an Appendix) made, and to be printed. (No. 234.)

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [H.L.]

Report from the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.], the Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.], and the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], That the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], ought to be allowed to proceed. The said Report (with the Proceedings of the Committee), to be printed. [No. 235.] Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out; Bill reported with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. [No. 236.]

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN.

VISCOUNT GALWAY rose to call attention to the fact that no grant had yet been received by county councils towards the expenses incurred for the medical inspection of children. The noble Viscount said: My Lords, it may be thought that in alluding to the education question at the present moment I am raising a somewhat delicate matter, but I can assure the House and His Majesty's

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Government that it is not my intention to interfere in the slightest degree with a satisfactory settlement of this much-discussed question if such a settlement can be arrived at. The point I wish to bring before your Lordships' notice is of a different character, and has reference to the cost thrown upon county councils for the medical inspection of children. The Act of 1907 enacted that it was the duty of county councils to provide for the medical inspection of children immediately before, or at the time of, or as soon as possible after, admission to the public elementary school. Regulation No. 576 followed in November of that year, and in Paragraph 4 the respective duties of the Board of Education and the local education authority were clearly set out. That paragraph stated—

> "The duties thrown upon the Board consist in advising the local education authorities as to the manner in which they should carry out the provisions of the Act, and in supervising the work they are called upon to do."

The next paragraph stated that—

> "The duty of carrying out the actual inspection has necessarily been entrusted by Parliament to local education authorities and not to the Board."

Therefore it will be seen that the whole question of managing the medical inspection devolves upon the local education authorities. Further on, the Regulation stated that three inspections were advisable—one when the child entered the school, another about the middle of its school life, and again before it left school.

I should like to say that I have no wish to disparage the great value which the medical inspection of children may be to the nation, or to thwart its being properly carried out. My point is that these demands on the local education authorities seem to go on increasing. The form as to diseases, which has to be filled up in duplicate in regard to every scholar, throws enormous labour on the medical officers appointed to carry out this work and on the chief medical officer, and consequently adds to the cost to the ratepayers. The medical officer has to report on a variety of things, and it is also laid down that he shall report to the Board of Education if the Schedules of the Board are not carried out faithfully. I may be wrong in my interpretation of the clause, but it reads as if the medical officer of the county council is to report to the Board of Education if their Schedules are not carried out. Surely the proper course would be for the Board of Education to make these inquiries through the proper channel—the clerk to the county council.

When the Act of 1907 was under discussion we were given to understand that county councils would get a substantial grant towards the extra charge which would be thrown on the rates, and a great many local education authorities hesitated to appoint officers under the Act until they knew what financial assistance they were likely to get from His Majesty's Government. As I have said, I do not wish to disparage the great value of this medical inspection, but it is of national, and not merely of local, importance, and it is, therefore, not unreasonable to hope that there will be a substantial contribution from the national Exchequer. I would ask His Majesty's Government to remember that every additional burden thrown on the ratepayers of the country is an additional burden also on the industries of the country, and thereby tends to the unemployment which we all so much regret at the present time.

There is one other point to which I should like to call attention. Section 10 of Regulation No. 576 says—

> "The directions given in this circular as to the degree and frequency of inspection refer only to minimum medical inspection, the effectiveness of which will in future be one of the elements to be considered in determining the efficiency of each school as a grant-aided school."

I venture to think that if, when these medical inspection clauses were before Parliament, it had been clearly stated that medical inspection of children was going to be made one of the points on which the efficiency grant would depend, the medical inspection clauses would not have passed as they did. In this case we have another illustration of the Board making regulations beyond what Parliament ever contemplated or intended. It is not the first time we have had to complain of this, and I hope the tendency will diminish in the future. The question of medical inspection should be kept entirely separate from the education demands of the Board of Education, and it should not be allowed in any way to affect the efficiency grant. I hope His Majesty's Government will be able to give the House a distinct assurance on both of the points I have raised.

LORD BELPER: My Lords, before the noble Earl replies, I should like to say a few words, not only to support what my noble friend has said, but also to point out what the exact position is with regard to the financial promises made on the subject of medical inspection. This matter, which is of the utmost importance to county councils, has been taken up by the County Councils Association, and there has been more than one deputation to the Minister in charge of the Board of Education. A very strong deputation from the County Councils Association waited upon Mr. McKenna in February last, and put before him the claims of county councils that medical inspection should be recognised as a national matter and that a grant should be made towards it. They pointed out how unfortunate it would be if, through the constant increase of the rates, the ratepayers got to dislike education, and as far as they could, refused to allow their representatives to spend extra money, especially on higher education. Mr. McKenna informed the deputation that he entirely sympathised with the view put before him. He said that medical inspection should be looked upon as part of the general charge for education, but he agreed that there was considerable ground for the view that the local education authorities should receive some grant from the Exchequer. He went on to say that he did not propose that that grant should be earmarked, but that a new grant should be given that would do far more than meet the cost of the additional requirements of the Bill. He added that it would be possible for the deputation to meet their ratepayers with a substantial reduction in the rates. That was a promise of a substantial grant, not only to cover present charges for education, but to allow also a reasonable sum in addition for medical inspection.

That sounded very satisfactory, but, when they looked into the figures the County Councils Association came to the conclusion, not only that there would be no grant for medical inspection at all, but that the grants that were going to be given would not be sufficient to cover the services of the Bill, and that, so far from being better off, the majority of the county councils would be worse off than at present. A deputation from the Association waited upon Mr. Runciman, who was then Minister for Education, and laid the figures before him. Mr. Runciman made certain criticisms regarding the figures. No doubt the figures were open to criticism, because they had been prepared by different counties, and were not, of course, on precisely the same lines. When those criticisms were made we at once offered to have new figures drawn up on the one basis, and to submit them to the Board of Education, whose officials could go thoroughly into them with the officials of the County Councils Association to see whether they might be taken as fairly representing the charges that would be thrown by the Bill on the county councils. Those figures were got out and submitted to the Board of Education, who were more than once asked to allow their officials to go into them. I regret to say that they did not see their way to examine the figures or to discuss them in any way; but the effect of those figures, which I contend are now unchallenged, is that upon every county council appearing in the list I have in my hand a considerable extra charge will be thrown. That varies in a very marked degree. The extra charge placed upon my own county if these figures are correct, and they have not been disputed, would be something over £12,000 a year, or an extra rate beyond that now being paid of something like 3d. in the £, that is a 40 per cent. increase on the rates raised for education. It is natural, therefore, that we should feel very great anxiety as to whether we are to receive assistance towards the expenses incurred for medical inspection.

I do not wish to discuss matters which are before the other House and which will be contained in the Bill now under discussion there; but as Mr. McKenna said that the grant for medical inspection must be included in the general grant given by the Government, it is absolutely necessary to see whether that grant is sufficient, not only for the purposes for which it is intended, but also to meet the charge for medical inspection. That is the position in which we now stand, and I think we have a right to press for an assurance in some form or another that a reasonable grant will be given towards the cost of medical inspection, which admittedly should be largely a national charge. My noble friend has referred to the fact that we are threatened with the loss of the education grants if we do not carry out medical inspection efficiently. We have every wish to carry out this work, but while the Government holds its hand it is difficult to persuade the ratepayers to put their hands into their pockets and find money for the purpose.

There is another Circular--No. 596—to which my noble friend did not allude. It covers nine pages, and contains not only regulations with regard to medical inspection, but an immense clause—no other word can be used—setting out what the annual report upon medical inspection is to contain. It goes in the greatest detail into every possible consideration that a medical officer ought to have in view. I need only quote one short subsection. An account is asked for of the methods of inspection adopted, including—

> "General review of the relation of home circumstances and social and industrial conditions to the health and physical condition of the children inspected, so far as facts bearing on this point have come under notice."

If you take that literally, it is a report on the home life and the health of every child in every school in the county. I do not desire in the least to criticise the Report asked for. I understand from those who have the technical knowledge that it is an admirable Memorandum for the purpose with a view to what may perhaps eventually be carried out, but that it is quite impossible at the present time that the Report can go into the vast number of matters mentioned. I am informed that it is not expected that county councils should make the reports in this detail in the earlier days. Indeed, the Board of Education seem to have been satisfied of the impossibility themselves, because they say—

> "As regards the scope of the Report, however, the Board consider that it is desirable that it should deal with the whole subject of school hygiene, and should cover as much as possible of the ground indicated under the following heads. It is recognised that these heads suggest a degree of comprehensiveness which in many, and indeed in most, cases will not be immediately attainable."

That qualification points out that in a great number of these matters we are not to act at once. I hope an assurance will be given that no undue severity will be used against county councils in their endeavour to carry out the requirement as to these Reports. I am sure that the work will be better done if efficiency is reached by slow degrees rather than by attempting all that may be obtainable in the future at the first moment. If there is any dissatisfaction with the heavy cost of education, the higher and scientific education, which is of the utmost importance to the country, will be certain to suffer. I have ventured to make these remarks not in any spirit of hostility. This is not a political matter in any sense, and I cordially agree with my noble friend Viscount Galway in hoping that we shall see the Bill now being discussed in the other House brought to a satisfactory issue. But, in the meanwhile, the question of finance is a most urging and pressing one, and I therefore think that this is not an inopportune moment to bring this matter to the notice of His Majesty's Government.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The EARL OF CREWE): My Lords, I have been asked to reply to the question of the noble Viscount opposite and I make no complaint whatever either of his speech or of that of the noble Lord who has just sat down. At the same time, as I shall be able to show, and as I think the noble Lord himself is aware, there are circumstances connected with the discussion in another place which make it difficult to deal quite fully with the matter this afternoon.

As the noble Viscount said, the duty of medical inspection is thrown upon the local education authority by Section 13 of the Administrative Provisions Act, which we passed with great unanimity of feeling last year. The noble Viscount seemed to me rather to belong to the school which regarded this not so much as a matter of education as of public health, and I believe there have been all through people who thought that this burden never ought to have been placed on the education rate at all, and that the duty ought, in some form or another, to have been placed on the public health authority. However that may be, and I confess I do not agree with that view, in any case it would have caused great administrative inconvenience in the counties, because there, as we all know, the health authority is not the same as the education authority, and you would have started dual control of a very inconvenient kind. I might point out in addition that even before the Act of 1902 a good deal of very effective medical inspection had been carried out by school boards, and it was generally considered that it was rather a matter for the education authority than for the public health authority; that being so, it is clear that in the first instance, whatever may be done afterwards, the cost must fall on the education rate.

During the current year, as I understand, there has been a considerable outcry on the part of local authorities at the prospect of this expenditure falling upon the rates, and the whole matter has to be considered in connection with what has been said as to increased grants on behalf of the Board of Education by the former President. Your Lordships will remember that early in this year—I think it was in March—Mr. McKenna issued a White Paper explaining the financial proposals of the Education Bill of 1908. The general effect was that the seven, I think they are, different kinds of grants now given to schools should be amalgamated, and only a single grant given. Mr. McKenna made it quite clear, when he was approached by deputations on the question of this medical inspection, that if help was to be given from central funds for that purpose it must be given in the general grant, and that it was not the intention of the Government to start a special grant for that purpose. Indeed, I think it stands to reason that the moment at which you are doing away with the multiplied grants would be an unfortunate moment at which to start a new and separate grant distinct from the general grant.

Then, as your Lordships are aware, the Education Bill came to a pause, and in those circumstances the outcry of the local authorities naturally increased. The financial proposals were part of Mr. McKenna's Bill, and it seemed as though, if that Bill did not go through, the financial proposals would not go through either. Since then, however, as your Lordships all know, the situation has changed, and the financial proposals equally form part of the present Bill; and it is this fact which makes it difficult for me to enter into any financial details on the present occasion. I understand that the clause which embodies them will be considered, according to the allotment of business in another place, on Monday next, when the whole of this matter will be argued out. Therefore, I think noble Lords will see that it would be impossible for me to enter to-day into any detail with regard to the proposed grant. When Mr. Runciman's statement has been made it will be clearly open to the noble Viscount or the noble Lord to reopen the matter at any time on the question of the inadequacy of the grant to meet this particular charge. It is generally admitted—I think the Board of Education fully admit it—that this medical inspection, if properly carried out, must involve a new burden on the local authorities; but many of the figures quoted on the subject have been undoubtedly greatly exaggerated. The noble Lord mentioned, I think, the figure of £12,000 for Nottinghamshire—or was it £18,000?

LORD BELPER: The figure was £12,000. But that is not for medical inspection. Medical inspection was mixed up by Mr. McKenna with the whole of the grants. He said that the total grant would be more than enough to meet the expenditure and leave a great deal to spare. We say that we shall get £12,000 less in Nottinghamshire.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am glad to hear the noble Lord's explanation. I understood him to say that the amount chargeable in respect of medical inspection in Nottinghamshire would be £12,000 a year, which seemed to me a rather fanciful estimate. Although I can quite understand the anxiety of the county councils upon it, the matter is not actually an urgent one, because the amount expended anywhere in respect of the present financial year can only be very small. Very few, I think, of the local authorities got to work much before the middle of this year, and therefore the whole matter will be settled, we assume, by the new grant, whether noble Lords think it adequate or not, in the next financial proposals. The matter consequently is not, in point of cash, so immediately urgent as might have been supposed from the speeches of the noble Lords. On the question of exaggeration, a deputation from a great county borough which waited upon the Board of Education said medical inspection there would cost 2s. 9d. per child; but when they undertook it on a larger scale than was supposed to be covered by that sum the cost was somewhere between 6d. and 1s. Therefore I think we may venture to hope that some of the fears of local authorities as to the charges which are likely to be made under this head are somewhat groundless.

LORD BELPER: The cost of medical inspection, taken in the whole of the counties, is 1s. per child. That is for next year.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It is worked out for next year at 1s. per child?

LORD BELPER: Yes.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Exactly. The estimate that is made for the whole country is a farthing rate. It is perfectly true that in some districts the charge may be relatively higher than in other places. I am afraid that is all I can say, because it is quite clear that we cannot, in the present position of the Bill in another place, discuss anything in the nature of actual figures. But I can assure the noble Viscount that the Board of Education are fully aware of the importance of this subject, and they do recognise the fact that a very substantial charge must be placed upon local authorities by the Act of last year. I do not entirely follow the complaint of the noble Viscount as to the effect of this being regarded as a test of the efficiency of the school. If the noble Viscount looks at the Act he will see that, under subsection (1) of Section 3, it is the duty of the local authority to provide for the medical inspection of children under the conditions which the noble Viscount read. Well, if it is a duty and that duty is neglected, the Board of Education, I should have thought, could only show its sense of the fact that the duty had been neglected in the manner of which the noble Viscount complains. We cannot regard the whole business as being distinct from education for the reasons I have stated; and, that being so, it seems to me that the Board of Education is entirely justified in taking the view which the noble Viscount thinks an unreasonable one. I have nothing to add, beyond assuring noble Lords once more that the Board of Education is fully aware of the position, and that in considering the amount of the grant this question of medical inspection will be borne in mind.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, nobody will doubt the sympathetic tone with which the noble Earl has just spoken, but the fact that he has to defer to a future day anything beyond an academic expression of sympathy is not at all encouraging, and my noble friend Viscount Galway can hardly be expected to let the matter drop with any feeling of complacency and satisfaction. I do not know whether it is of any use; but I have, on one or two occasions, ventured to invite the attention of the House to the extraordinary anomaly of placing additional charges on local authorities without any previous consideration having been given as to how they are to be met. I speak with some feeling on this subject, because within the last few weeks the London County Council have had to pass a very large vote for an increase of staff, I think even for this year, amounting to something like £10,000, in order to begin to carry out this very heavy, though probably very desirable, duty.

I ask your Lordships to consider the very different manner in which the public exchequer is protected as compared with the local exchequer. A Bill which even takes a ten-pound note out of the public exchequer has to be brought in in Committee of Supply; those provisions which involve a charge on the exchequer have to be specially underlined, and the House of Commons considers that point before it proceeds to the general consideration of the Bill. But when a measure is proposed which lays a considerable charge on local authorities it very often slips through Parliament without consideration, or, at all events, without the smallest estimate being asked for as to whether the charge is to amount to a 1d. rate, a 2d. rate, or a much higher rate. The House should bear in mind the enormous indebtedness of the local authorities, and the great pressure already existing on the rates. Some policy should be adopted of bringing these measures forward in a special manner before the notice of Parliament, and they should not be allowed to pass without being referred to a special Committee with orders to report as to the likely incidence of the charge. The medical inspection of school children, especially in view of the statistics which have been laid before us, is a matter of national moment and probably a national necessity; obviously, therefore, it should be a national and not a local charge. I did not rise to do more than throw out the suggestion I have made.

LORD CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH: My Lords, I shall not detain the House for more than a minute, but I rise to reply to the statement of the noble Earl the Leader of the House that he could not understand our particular grievance in objecting to the Board of Education taking neglect on the part of the local education authority to have a proper system of medical inspection as a test of the efficiency of the school. The noble Earl said the duty is cast on the local education authority to do this, and therefore it is quite proper that the grant given to them should be stopped if they fail in their duty. But our grievance is this, that this duty was cast upon us because it was the most convenient way of having medical inspection carried out. It was admitted on all hands that the object of the inspection was not purely educational, but partly national; therefore, it was something quite distinct from anything which the local education authorities ever thought to be part of their duty in providing educational instruction in the schools. The grants which have up to this point been given have been awarded invariably for educational work done in the schools or for the educational efficiency of the buildings themselves, and it is very hard that neglect of this new duty cast upon local education authorities should be met by taking off a grant which was given for a totally different purpose. We entirely deny that medical inspection is a form of education; it is a duty cast upon us for the national good, and we maintain that the National Exchequer should assist us, and that the Department should not adopt the expedient of cutting off grants for which services have been already rendered.

VISCOUNT GALWAY: My Lords, although we have not obtained quite as satisfactory an answer from the noble Earl as we should have wished, we at any rate have the admission that this work of medical inspection does demand some contribution from the National Exchequer. As to stopping the grant in respect of the efficiency of the school, I should like to have had some assurance that in the present transition stage there will be no question of withdrawing the grant from county councils, at any rate for another year, while they are appointing inspectors to carry out this work.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, the question which the noble Viscount opposite has brought before the House, and in regard to which he has received the support of my noble friend who is chairman of the County Councils Association, is undoubtedly one worthy of the attention of Parliament; but the Government feel that owing to the course of business, especially in regard to education, they are not in a position to make a statement in every way as satisfactory as could be wished. Naturally, it was our hope that the financial proposals which were an integral part of the educational proposals of the Government might, with others, have received the sanction of Parliament, and in that case the matter, even if it had been urgent, still would not have been as urgent as undoubtedly it is at the present moment in the eyes of local education authorities. I certainly can say that, in regard to the policy of the immediate future, the Board of Education will bear in mind the financial complications of this matter. At the same time, we feel that physical training, of which medical inspection is really at the root, is a matter of great urgency and importance, in some ways as important almost as education itself. Indeed, the two things are so closely connected from a scientific point of view that it is not necessary for me to labour that point. I think this particular question has also been unfortunate in that it has arrived in the world of local finance at the same time as other questions which have not been the result of the policy of the Government or of any desire on the part of the local authorities themselves to spend more money upon what may be called ancient services, but which have been entirely due to causes beyond the control of Parliament and the local authorities. I refer to such matters as the greatly increased cost of the upkeep of roads and highways. This additional expenditure, coming simultaneously with the increase in educational charges, has exasperated the local authorities, and I could only wish that the whole situation was more under the control of the Government than it is. But, clearly, the great increase in the cost of the upkeep of our roads through motor and similar traffic is not a matter for which the Government has any responsibility. I am afraid that what I am saying is rather cold comfort; but noble Lords opposite know that, as a former chairman of a county council, I am entirely in sympathy with them, and I can assure them that in regard to the immediate future the Board of Education will do its best to recognise the difficulties of local education authorities in the matter.

INCEST BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Fitzmaurice.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS: My Lords, I think I shall best commend this Bill, the subject of which is of a very painful and distressing nature, by self-restraint and reserve rather than by any force of words. The object of the Bill is to make incest what it is in Scotland, what it is in a number of our Colonies, what it is in certain of the States of America and in a large number of civilised countries, but what at the present moment it is not in England—a crime.

The Bill enacts that any male person who has carnal knowledge of a female person, who is to his knowledge his granddaughter, daughter, sister, or mother, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and upon conviction thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the Judge of Assize, to be kept in penal servitude for any term not less than three years, and not exceeding seven years, or to be imprisoned for any time not exceeding two years with or without hard labour. All else is detail, which can be better discussed in Committee than on Second Reading. The special reason for introducing the Bill, which has already passed the House of Commons, is the great frequency of incest. It appears, from a communication made to the Home Office by the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, that the society has records of no less than forty-two cases brought to their notice in the last twelve months, some of which are described as being of the most appalling nature. The Home Office, I am also informed, has been told that the Birmingham education authority know of eleven cases of persons living under these circumstances at present in that city, ten being cases of father and daughter and one of brother and sister. I am further told that, as regards cases of rape and carnal knowledge of girls which came before the Home Office on petitions for remission of sentence, it was found that in no fewer than fifty-one out of 193 cases the criminal intercourse was incestuous. Thirty-six cases have also come to the notice of the Metropolitan Police alone, and twelve to the notice of the Liverpool police.

I had hoped that the noble and learned Lord the Lord Chief Justice would have been able to be present to-night to support this Bill. He is, however, detained at the Assizes at Birmingham, but he has sent me this telegram—

> "You can state that I support the Bill. I have received and sent to the Home Secretary presentments of grand juries pointing out the urgent necessity for an amendment of the law, in consequence of the frequency of assaults by fathers on their daughters."

These, my Lords, are facts which speak for themselves, and, I venture to think, justify this Bill. There are objections which might, perhaps, be taken, such as the objection to the evil of publication; but I am told that in Scotland, where incest has been a crime for more than three centuries, the newspapers treat these cases with very great discretion and that no real evil has arisen. It may be said, again, that this would offer opportunity for blackmail. I reply that this is not the experience of Scotland; and, further, if this is to be made a reason of itself against the Bill it is surely a reason also against dealing with any of the offences included in the Criminal Law Amendment Act. I venture to think that the frequency of this terrible form of crime, as I hope it will be now formally made in England, justifies this measure; and, without further language, I will move its Second Reading, in the hope that the Bill, which has passed through the other House with the good wishes of both sides, may receive similar treatment at your Lordships' hands.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Albans.*)

THE LORD STEWARD (Earl BEAUCHAMP): My Lords, I think all your Lordships will agree that we owe a very great debt of gratitude to the right rev. Prelate who has just spoken. As he very rightly said, this is not a pleasant topic or one which any member of your Lordships' House would wish to discuss at length. My chief object in rising is to say that while His Majesty's Government do not think this is a matter which they would be justified in bringing to your Lordships' notice or taking full responsibility for, yet the Home Secretary and the Home Office hope that your Lordships will see your way to pass the Bill into law. They are convinced of the necessity for legislation to deal with this evil, and, therefore, they hope the Bill may become law during the present session. I do not know that it is necessary to add much to what was said by the right rev. Prelate, but this, however, I might say. In a certain number of crimes of a similar character it might be argued that it would be desirable not to take steps with regard to them, because they affect nobody but those immediately concerned; but your Lordships will see that that is not the case with regard to crimes of this character, and that there are, as the result of intercourse between the various people mentioned in the Bill, offspring on whom the punishment chiefly falls. In these circumstances I venture to hope your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, the mischief aimed at by this Bill, is one which your Lordships must all admit to be a very serious and grave one; and not in this House, or I should think anywhere in the country, are there two opinions as to the desirability of reducing that mischief. But, personally, I have some little hesitation in feeling certain that a Bill which turns this particular mischief into a crime in the eyes of the law will necessarily reduce it. I do not know the statistics, but I cannot help thinking that the amount of the mischief is really very small, and that in the great majority of families in this country such a mischief as is aimed at by this Bill never enters into the heads of anyone. Newspapers may exercise, in regard to trials of this kind, a very proper discretion, but you have people in Court, the jury and neighbours, and there is the danger of something which had never entered the heads of people being put there by proceedings of this kind. I think I remember that the noble and learned Earl the ex-Lord Chancellor used sometimes to express doubts as to the wisdom of legislation of this character. I agree that this particular Bill, if it is desired to deal with the matter by legislation, is drawn in what I venture to say respectfully is, perhaps, the best possible way that it could be drawn, and meets the mischief in the best possible manner; and in the subsidiary clauses, as to the custody of the children, I am sure your

Lordships must all concur. I cannot help myself feeling some doubt as to whether the measure will in the end prove remedial. The matter is one which it is obviously difficult to discuss, but I would venture to suggest that if the Bill is read a second time it should be sent to a Select Committee, so that the evidence of those who have to deal with the administration of the law may be obtained as to the best way of dealing with this matter.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I rise to state in two or three words my own view about this matter. I do hope that, whatever the House does, it will not send this Bill to a Select Committee. That would only mean the destruction of the Bill by a side wind. If it is wrong, it is much better to throw it out now and be done with it. The question is whether this will be an effective remedy. There is no other remedy known to the law except to punish people who commit acts which are considered to be crimes. I cannot help thinking that it is better that the community should stigmatise as a crime that which is a crime in substance, seeing that it produces not only moral depravity but also physical deterioration. I hope your Lordships will see your way to give the Bill a Second Reading.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I wish to add one word to what has fallen from other speakers on this Bill. The course of legislation dealing with this exceedingly unpleasant subject has been a peculiar one. A Bill was introduced in the last Parliament by the noble Earl opposite, Lord Donoughmore. The noble and learned Earl, Lord Halsbury, rose, I think at once, and strongly objected to the Second Reading of the Bill—I have every reason to believe he still maintains that opinion—and a general agreement was expressed in the House that it should not be proceeded with. Therefore, the practical unanimity with which the Bill has been received on this occasion is, in itself, perhaps, rather singular. I somewhat differ, with great respect, from my right hon. friend the Home Secretary, as regards the advantage of passing a measure of this kind, mainly on the ground that I am under the impression that a very large proportion of the cases—90 per cent. or more—can already be dealt with either under the Cruelty to Children Acts or under the Criminal Law Amendment Act. I also to some extent share the opinion expressed by the noble Earl behind me. I do not, however, desire to oppose the Second Reading. Perhaps this is one of the cases where the Bill might with advantage go to the Standing Committee, where its consideration could be more freely and profitably carried on than in Committee of the Whole House. I therefore hope the Bill will be allowed to go to the Standing Committee when the time comes.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

THE ALIENS ACT.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE rose "to call attention to the administration of the Aliens Act; and to move for Papers." The noble Earl said: My Lords, I have not placed this notice on the Paper with the intention of in any way raising the policy of the Aliens Act, or troubling your Lordships with any lengthy observations upon the general question of whether or not we should exclude aliens from this country. I rather wish to take the view that the Act is on the Statute-book, and that it is one of the few great Acts of their predecessors which His Majesty's Government are not busily attempting to modify by new legislation. I therefore accept the Act as a starting point. I do not desire in any way to go into its merits. At the same time I am sure noble Lords opposite will allow me to say that a new theory has been imported into the administration of this country during the last few years. I do not think the Home Office were the originators of it. I think the Irish Office can claim that distinction. But a new idea seems to be abroad that it is the duty of the Government not to administer Acts as they find them, but in a way as favourable as possible to their own personal opinions, even though it may be contrary to the intentions of Parliament. That is what has taken place undoubtedly in the case of the Aliens Act. In fact, by its administration it has been turned into a farce.

May I, very briefly, remind your Lordships of what is, after all, the salient point in the working of the Act? One of its most important clauses defined an immigrant ship—and the Act applies to no ship that is not an immigrant ship—as a ship arriving with twenty steerage passengers or such smaller number as the Secretary of State for the Home Department should determine. Inquiries made between the passing of the Act and the coming into office of the present Administration evidently convinced the Secretary of State for the time that twenty was too large a number if the Act was to be made effective, and twelve was therefore substituted. That was in December, 1905; but in March of the following year the present Home Secretary changed the number again to twenty. Thus all that the most criminal or most diseased alien has got to do is to wait in one of the large ports abroad and keep his eye steadily glued on vessels leaving for England, and when he finds a ship leaving with only eighteen steerage passengers he can join it, knowing that the Act would be unable to keep him out of this country. The result has been that the traffic has been regularly organised, and whereas the sheep, as I may describe the desirable aliens according to the Act, are fully inspected by medical and immigration officers, the goats—those aliens whom it is known are unlikely to pass such inspection—are sent over to this country in batches of nineteen or less, and in that case the medical officer makes a merely formal examination of them, and there is absolutely no power of rejection.

According to the latest Return, 61,758 aliens arrived in this country last year, a decrease of 2,555 as compared with the total for 1906. Owing to the fact that 20,564 arrived in non-immigrant vessels, the number inspected was 41,194, a decrease of 3,089 as compared with the number inspected in the previous year. Of 6,143 passengers who arrived in London only 2,354 were inspected, more than one-half of the total number having arrived in non-immigrant ships. The result must be that large numbers of aliens are coming in whom the Act was intended to exclude and who ought to be excluded in the interests of the community.

Two cases will show how the Act is working. The first was the well-known case of twenty-six German gipsies who, having been rejected at Hartlepool, left, and, dividing themselves into two parties of fourteen and twelve respectively, landed at Leith about two years ago. The Secretary of State, when questioned on the subject in the House of Commons, pointed out that the objectionable practice on the part of shipowners of dividing a party in order to secure entry was contrary to the spirit of the Act, and as regards the ships of the firm concerned, the Secretary of State cut down the number from twenty to two, and claimed that his action in that case prevented any further entry of undesirables. Those twenty-six persons, who had been stamped by the officers at Hartlepool as undesirables, roamed about the country, causing a nuisance in many places and putting the local authorities to considerable expense. In Cheshire it was found necessary to tell off 159 policemen for special duty in regard to aliens who had been allowed to land before the Home Secretary's Special Order was issued. The country has been saddled with the presence of these aliens, who could and should have been kept out if the Act had been carried out in a proper spirit, and twelve had been allowed to remain the number of steerage passengers constituting a vessel an immigrant ship. The second case is known as the Hull case, and in that instance four Russian-Jew immigrants who had been refused permission to land were promptly landed from a non-immigrant ship. The Home Secretary stated that he had little doubt that such a practice was carred on in a systematic way at Hull, and he told us that it was engaging his attention. So far as we know, it is still engaging his attention, and presumably this infamous practice still remains possible.

The only remedy is to cut down the number of steerage passengers who constitute the vessel carrying them an immigrant ship, and render the passengers subject to inspection in accordance with the Act. In regard to the Leith case, the Secretary of State claimed that by cutting down the number from twenty to two any further entry of these undesirables has been prevented; and I submit that there is no reason for the Government refusing to adopt a similar procedure in all the ports in the kingdom to which this Act applies.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House Papers relating to the administration of the Aliens Act."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, the noble Earl has directed attention to one feature in the administration of the Aliens Act, and to one alone. There is, however, another feature in connection with which, I hope, he thinks His Majesty's Government does deserve some credit. I allude to that part of the Act which has reference to the deportation of aliens whose expulsion has been recommended by various Courts of justice throughout the country. I hope the noble Earl will kindly look at the Reports which have been laid on the Table of your Lordships' House, and I am sure he will be satisfied with the action taken by the Home Office in that regard. Admittedly, prevention is better than cure; but if aliens want to enter this country, it is possible for them to find more than one way of evading the Act. Take, for instance, the case of first-class passengers. First-class passengers can enter without let or hindrance, for the provisions in the Aliens Act apply only to steerage passengers. I cannot help being struck by the fact that the noble Earl has mentioned the cases of only thirty undesirable people having come into the country during the period of two years and nine months that the Act has been in force. With regard to the case of the German gipsies, I would point out that there is no immigration officer or medical inspector at Hartlepool, because it is not an immigration port, and therefore those gipsies could not have been stamped there as undesirables. But supposing the course recommended by the noble Earl had been taken and the number of passengers reduced from twenty to twelve, it would still have been possible for those gipsies to have divided themselves into three parties instead of two and thus to have evaded the Act. It is perfectly true that the Secretary of State made an order reducing the number to two in the case of a particular line of steamers, and I think the action of my right hon. friend in that case shows that it is within the power, and that it is the desire of the Secretary of State to prevent such aliens from coming into this country. I am informed that these gipsies to whom the noble Earl referred have all since left the country. In the case of the systematic importation of destitute aliens to Hull from a particular port abroad on a particular line of ships, the Home Secretary has been enabled to take such steps as have led to the cessation of that traffic. The fact is that the machinery of this Act, with its constant statistics which are always coming to the notice of the Home Office, enables the Secretary of State to keep in touch with the constantly varying features of this alien traffic, and to strike whenever any necessity is really shown. I think we may fairly claim, on behalf of the Government, that the Home Secretary has exercised his powers fairly and fully, and, I hope, to the entire satisfaction of the two Houses of Parliament.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: My Lords, as far as I understood the speech of my noble friend who initiated this discussion the two specific cases that he raised were given as instances, and not as in any sense a representation of what is really happening. The noble Earl the Lord Steward has not, I venture to say, given any reason why the Home Office regulation should not have fixed, if not two, at any rate twelve, as the number under the clause in question. I find, from a perusal of the figures, that in certain ports of the kingdom the proportion of immigrants who come in in non-immigrant ships is larger than it was, and that in some cases there are actually more immigrants coming in in non-immigrant ships than in immigrant ships. The Home Office have only to alter the number in order to turn these non-immigrant ships into immigrant ships and thus have these people investigated. There is, too, a distinct increase in the number of aliens to whom poor law relief has been granted, and in particular there is a large proportionate increase in the number of aliens of unsound mind who pass through the hands of the Poor Law authorities. Are not those the kind of undesirable aliens for instance of whose entry the Lord Steward asked? I cannot help thinking that at this particular time, when unemployment is so serious a question that His Majesty's Government are driven to adopt special measures to deal with it, the Government have at least one remedy for that evil to their hand, for they can, by a stroke of the pen, render ships which are non-immigrant ships, whose undesirable aliens are not properly investigated, immigrant ships, whose passengers could be investigated. It might be that you would not thereby keep out a great many more, but perhaps you would. It is a mere matter of administration; and surely His Majesty's Government might try it. It does not conflict with any principle, but is, as I have said, merely a question of altering the number by a stroke of the pen; and I venture to think the noble Earl has given no reason why, in the present state of affairs, the Government should not take this very simple and obvious step. It might do some good, and obviously it could not do any harm.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I think the noble Earl who represents the Home Office may very fairly take credit for the manner in which the Act has been used for what always seemed to me one of its most valuable objects—the expulsion of undesirable people who had settled in this country. With regard to the turning back of such persons when attempting to land on these shores, I think my two noble friends have shown that there is reason to suppose that a little more vigilance is required than has yet been exercised. It is, of course, true that many people disliked the Aliens Act and were doubtful as to the wisdom of any measure of the kind. But, now that it is on the Statute-book, it seems to me obvious that it should be administered in such a way as to make it really effectual for the purpose for which it was designed. And, at this moment, there does seem to be something almost farcical in the way in which the Act is put into operation. You have a state of things under which the same individual can be turned back if he happens to form one of a party of twenty-one persons, but cannot be turned back if he happens to form one of a party of nineteen. And then, again, as I understand it, the same ship becomes an immigrant ship if she happens to have twenty steerage passengers, whereas she ceases to be an immigrant ship if, on the next voyage, she has only fourteen or fifteen. I do not say it is very easy to deal with these points, but I do think that just now, in particular, the matter should be watched, because, obviously, it is not beyond the power of these people, and of those who endeavour to land them in this country, so to organise the traffic that they will altogether elude the meshes of the Aliens Act. I do not know that we can take the matter further this evening. I would only express my hope that the evidence that has been produced will be carefully considered by the Home Office, and that whatever can be done to meet this difficulty will be done.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE, who had the following Question on the Paper—namely: "To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what Government measures are likely to be submitted to this House during the remaining days of the session; and whether he is able to state approximately the amount of time which His Majesty's Government propose to allot to each of those measures"—said: My Lords, I do not think the noble Earl to whom I am going to address this Question will complain of me on the ground that it is in any way irrelevant or even premature. Indeed, many of my noble friends on this side of the House have, I know, for some time past, been extremely anxious that information should be elicited from His Majesty's Government as to the probable course of events during the remainder of the session, but I certainly felt that, so long as the Licensing Bill was still in suspense, it was not fair to invite His Majesty's Government to make any statement of the kind to the

House. Now, however, we are able to count the measures which still remain undisposed of, and, also, to count the days which will be available for dealing with them on the assumption which, I notice, is freely made out-of-doors, that the appropriate date for prorogation will fall before the arrival of Christmas.

I see that, of the Bills mentioned in the King's Speech, the following have still to come before your Lordships' House. In the first place, there is the Education Bill, which, of course, is not the Bill which came before Parliament earlier in the session, but an entirely new measure of which we are all aware. Then there is the Bill dealing with the hours of labour in coal mines. There is a Bill dealing with the Housing of the Working Classes and Town Planning. That, I may mention, is a Bill covering thirty-three pages besides six schedules—a Bill in which many of your Lordships take a great interest. There is the Port of London Bill—another very lengthy Bill, covering fifty-three pages and dealing with an expenditure of no less than twenty-three millions of money. Besides these, there is a Bill dealing with the Irish land question, and there are the two Scottish Bills which were revived this year—the Bills which your Lordships dealt with during the last session of Parliament. And to these there have been added several other Bills, one dealing with Scottish Education, one with the Prevention of Crime, and a Bill dealing with the use of White Phosphorous, in which, I am told, much interest is taken. The only Government measure which is now down on your Lordships' Paper is the Scottish Education Bill, which, I understand, will come on on Monday next. According to my calculations, and on the assumption which I made just now, there will be thirteen working days left for this House between Monday next and Christmas Eve, and what I wish to elicit from His Majesty's Government is some information as to the manner in which those few days are to be turned to account.

I will venture to make one or two observations. In the first place with regard to the Education Bill. This is a Bill which, I will take it upon myself to say, is regarded in this House with the most intense interest. The subject is one with which your Lordships have had a great deal to do, and this particular Bill, I might almost say, had its origin in this House, because I doubt extremely whether we should ever have heard of it had it not been for the initiative of the most rev. Primate, whose efforts to bring about an amicable settlement of this difficult question have elicited the sincere admiration even of those who do not entirely agree with him. I am told that the earliest date on which the Education Bill can come up to your Lordships' House is Monday, the 14th of this month. The usual sources of information acquaint us that upon that evening the Secretary of State for India intends to make a statement of the very utmost importance to your Lordships, but, assuming that the Secretary of State's statement does not prevent our commencing operations with the Education Bill, I do not think it is too much to assume—indeed, I do not know whether I have any right to make such an assumption—that the Education Bill, if it is to be at all discussed, would take the whole of that week. It comes to us recommended as an amicable settlement of the education question, and for that reason we shall all of us, no doubt, approach it with a favourable predisposition. But we shall most certainly expect to have time to consider it fully and to discuss it, not only in the debate on Second Reading, but on the Committee stage. Therefore, I think I am not making an extravagant assumption, when I assume that at least the whole of the week beginning 14th December will be required for the Education Bill.

How, then, shall we stand at the beginning of the following week—Monday, the 21st? We shall be within four days of Christmas Eve, and we shall still have to deal with the whole of the other Bills I have mentioned—the Coal Mines Bill, the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, the Port of London Bill; I do not refer to the Irish Land Bill because, I take it, it is not seriously intended that it should be persevered with at present. It is, I think, pretty obvious that it will be a physical impossibility for your Lordships' House, even if we proceed with the extraordinary expedition which sometimes characterises our debates at the end of the session, to undertake the consideration of all these important measures, and I want to ask the noble Earl whether he can tell us how His Majesty's Government suggest we should proceed. They must obviously have had this matter under their consideration. They must have plans of some kind of their own. We have had in the past many protests and many promises in regard to this subject, but I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that at this moment the prospect is more hopeless than it has ever been towards the end of a session. We were asked to meet again in the autumn with the idea of giving more time to the discussion of public business. The only result, so far as I can see, is that still further measures have been added to those which were already before Parliament, and that the congestion of business, instead of being less, is greater than it was before.

I can assure the noble Earl opposite that I raise this question without any desire to make party capital out of it. The difficulty is one which confronts noble Lords opposite at this moment, but it is a difficulty which has confronted, and must confront again whatever Government is in power. It arises from several causes. One of these, if I may say so without disrespect, is the voracious appetite for legislation which prevails at the time in which we live—an appetite which the Government of the day must endeavour to some extent to satisfy. Another cause is the extreme length and complexity of the Bills which are presented to Parliament. That, again, is perhaps, inevitable, because it seems to me to stand to reason that the more Bills you place upon the Statute-book the more complex and intricate become the Bills which succeed them, and which, in most cases, amend or modify them. And in the third place there is another obvious cause, which is the desire of Members of Parliament in both Houses, to take more part than they used to do in the discussion of public business. I say, therefore, that both parties are interested in discovering some means of relieving this congestion, this intolerable pressure, which arises year after year, and, although this is not the occasion for making suggestions—it would not be our business to make them—I will take upon myself to say that I do not believe that it should be beyond the power of Parliament to discover some means of solving this difficulty. I observed the other day that a distinguished colleague of the noble Earl, the Irish Secretary, made an intimation to the effect that if any Bills were to be carried over this session he expected his Bill, the Irish Land Bill, to be carried over. I do not know whether that revealed a glimpse of the intentions of His Majesty's Government —I do not pursue that suggestion further—but I am deeply convinced that, if both Houses and both political parties set their minds to it, it should be possible to discover some reasonable means of relieving Parliament of the necessity of doing twice over, in two successive sessions, work which has been done in the previous session, and of, at any rate, relieving this House from what I think I have before described as the scandalous situation in which we too often find ourselves placed in the expiring days of the session.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I am afraid I am not able to give a very full reply to the Question asked by the noble Marquess for reasons which I will explain in a moment. I desire to say at once that, in my judgment, nothing could have been fairer than the tone or temper in which the noble Marquess has approached the subject, which is itself one, as we all know, of extreme difficulty. In regard to the work at the moment it is the case, as the noble Marquess has said, that the Scottish Bill is the only Government Bill of any importance which is likely to be before the House in the immediate future. The Second Reading has been put down for Monday next. Therefore, this week and next are not fully occupied. The noble Marquess has supplied a reason for that in alluding to what I cannot help thinking he somewhat facetiously called the state of suspense in which the Licensing Bill was supposed to be. These are the days in which you would naturally have been giving consideration to that Bill in Committee had it passed a Second Reading. Unfortunately, as I have said, I am not able to give a full account because I cannot anticipate the statement which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will make in another place, and which, I understand, he may not be able to make this week. But I can say that, in addition to the Scottish Bill, I should hope that the Port of London Bill will reach its last stage in another place some time in the middle of next week, and it will then, of course, be available for our discussion. If the Education Bill finds a successful passage through another place it would be read there a third time on Saturday, the 12th, and a sitting would be held here to read it a first time upon that afternoon. That would enable the Second Reading to be taken on Tuesday, the 15th. I do not quarrel with the noble Marquess for saying that at any rate the greater part of that week, even if we were to sit, as I think the House might be disposed to do, both on Friday and on Saturday, if necessary, would have to be given to the discussion of the Education Bill. At the same time I think it is reasonable to point out that the subject is so exceedingly familiar to the House from the various occasions on which it has been discussed here, that discussion upon it ought to pass more rapidly than would naturally be the case with a Bill of that length and importance. At any rate the whole terminology is known to everybody—even to the point, I should imagine, of disgust—and discussion may therefore be fairly supposed to be more concentrated than would otherwise be the case. I am not in a position to-day to mention any more measures. It is perfectly true, as the noble Marquess points out, that all the measures mentioned in the King's Speech cannot possibly become law during the present session. It is, of course, our hope and desire that the prorogation should take place before Christmas, and supposing we sat on Friday and Saturday, it would leave nine working days from Monday, the 14th. I can at this moment only leave it to noble Lords to imagine how much more work besides the Education Bill can be included in those nine days.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, these discussions upon the time which is available for business have long ago lost the attraction of novelty for me, as I presume they have for everybody else. I have sat in this House now for ten years, and I have a distinct recollection of hearing similar speeches made from both sides once if not twice in the course of the year. The only difference between the discussion on this occasion and similar discussions in previous years is that what I would venture to call the Parliamentary harlequinade is to take place at a more appropriate season than usual. There is only one really effective means of dealing with a situation of this kind. I do, as a matter of fact, remember one occasion on which it was effectively dealt with, when noble Lords on the other side of the House succeeded, much to their credit, in talking out the Finance Bill. But there is a heroic method by which the difficulty can be confronted if necessary. I would remind the House of a Resolution unanimously passed by your Lordships' House on 6th April, 1905. It ran—

> "That this House, recognising its duties as a deliberative Assembly, protests against the practice of introducing Bills into it under conditions which afford insufficient time for their consideration, and declares its intention to refuse to consider any Bill unless sufficient opportunity be afforded for due deliberation thereon."

This appears to me to be an admirable occasion on which to put this Resolution into force. There is one important measure in the Government programme in which I take a personal interest. It is the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill. The noble Earl has preserved a judicious silence about the fate of that measure, and I would be much obliged if, before we separate, some light could be thrown on what is likely to happen to it. I do not wish to add my voice to the general grumble on this occasion, but I would venture to point out that there is no use in passing blood-and-thunder Resolutions of this kind unless you are prepared to act up to them. At the present moment I am afraid that if we were to act up to this Resolution our attitude would be liable to misrepresentation. We should be accused of being actuated not so much by want of time as by want of sympathy with the measures brought up. But if we on this side do ever sit upon the opposite side of the House again, I hope we shall act in a different way, and that if our own party send up Bills of great importance in the last days of the session, allowing practically not much more than a few minutes apiece for consideration, we shall decline to consider them. I submit that it is not much use making these protests unless we are in earnest, and the best way of showing that we are in earnest is to pursue when we are in office the policy I have indicated.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, one Bill has entirely escaped notice. I refer to the measure to consolidate the Agricultural Holdings Acts of Scotland, which has been down for some time on the Paper in the name of the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture. I think the fate of that Bill can be decided pretty easily one way or the other. I understand it has not been through the other House of Parliament, and it is not entirely a Consolidating Bill, there being new matter in it. In these circumstances, I suggest that either the Bill should have been brought on for consideration in this House before now, or we should be told that it is not to be carried through this session.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I will bring the matter to the notice of my noble friend, who, I am sorry to say, is not in his place to-day.

LORD NEWTON: What is the position of the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill?

THE EARL OF CREWE: I am afraid I am not in a position to inform the noble Lord. I should be very glad to, if I could.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill,—Lords Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill,—considered; to be read the third time upon Friday.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Holywell, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MONASTIC AND CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS.

Petition from Hackney, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Copy presented, of Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of The Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of July 1908 on duty on the Railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time; or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours, were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours' rest [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (FOREIGN COUNTRIES.)

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the principal and other Foreign Countries in each year from 1896 to 1905–6 (Thirty-fourth Number) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906,—Copy of the Workmen's Compensation Rules, 1908 (No. 2) dated 24th November, 1908 [by Act].

LAND PURCHASE PRICES (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing the average number of years purchase under the

Ashbourne Act for the years 1901 and 1902, and under the Act of 1903 to the 31st July, 1908, in the different counties of Ireland, as follows :—

	1901.	1902.	1903 Act.	
			With Bonus.	Excluding Bonus.
Ulster :—				
Antrim				
Armagh				
Cavan				
Donegal				
Down				
Fermanagh				
Londonderry				
Monaghan				
Tyrone				
Leinster :—				
Carlow				
Dublin				
Kildare				
Kilkenny				
King's				
Longford				
Louth				
Meath				
Queen's				
Westmeath				
Wexford				
Wicklow				
Munster :—				
Clare				
Cork				
Kerry				
Limerick				
Tipperary				
Waterford				
Connaught :—				
Galway				
Leitrim				
Mayo				
Roscommon				
Sligo				

—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (SCHEMES FOR REGULATION OF HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT).

Paper [presented 30th November] to be printed. [No. 341.]

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 24th November; *Mr. Field*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 342.]

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1895.

Copy presented, of six Orders in Council under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS, 1894 AND 1906.

Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 21st November, 1908, exempting German ships when in British ports from the provisions of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, relating to overloading, upon certain conditions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of licence granted by His Majesty to Emma Byron, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Lady Henry

Somerset Home, Duxhurst, Reigate [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of Order No. 7608 dated 24th November, 1908, permitting the landing at the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the s.s. "Crown Point" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of Order No. 7609, dated 24th November, 1908, permitting the landing at Birkenhead Foreign Animals Wharf of Animals carried on board the s.s. "Armenian" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of Order No. 7611, dated 25th November, 1908, permitting the landing at a Foreign Animals Wharf in great Britain of Animals carried on board the ss. "Manchester Trader" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Import Duties on British Salt abroad.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what are import duties on British salt in the several European countries, in the United States of America, in India, and in the self-governing Colonies of the Crown, respectively, classifying the salt as brown, light brown, pink and dark red rock, and as manufactured table salt.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The information desired by my hon. friend will be found fully set out on pages 589–590 of the Foreign Import Duties Return [Cd. 3859], and on pages 383–385 of the Colonial Import Duties Return [Cd. 3708]. The only amendments to be made to this information since the publication of these Returns refer to Bulgaria, where the duty on rock and kitchen salt is now 6 frs. per 100 kilogs. (2s. 5¼d. per cwt.) with an additional octroi duty of 20 per cent. of the Customs duty, and Australia where light brown and pink rock salt have been added to the free list.

Isle of Ely Small Holdings Committee and Co-operative Associations.

MR. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that the small holdings committee of the Isle of Ely County Council, in their report to the council upon the work already done in acquiring land for small holdings, recommend that for the present land be let to individuals and not to co-operative associations; and whether, in view of the provisions of the Small Holdings Act and of the many benefits resulting to all concerned from a system of co-operation, the Board of Agriculture will immediately point out to the Isle of Ely County Council the necessity for not adopting upon this particular point, the policy advocated by their committee.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board are already in communication with the county council, and one of the Commissioners will take an early opportunity of discussing the matter personally with them.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the United States.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether in view of the proclamation of two more States in the United States as infected with foot-and-mouth disease, he can state the policy of the Board with regard to this condition of affairs; and whether the Board does not consider that the time has come to prohibit all importations of live stock from the United States, even for slaughter at the port of entry.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board are carrying out their statutory obligations in regard to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in America. They are satisfied that the very stringent measures adopted by the Federal Government of the United States of America for stamping out and preventing the spread of the disease are sufficient to render the action suggested by the hon. Member unnecessary at the present time.

New Lighthouse Sites.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will say what sites have been acquired within the last ten years by the Trinity House and the Commissioners of Irish Lights, respectively, for purposes connected with the erection of new lighthouses, but not including those acquired for buoys, beacons, or other purposes, stating as regards each site the date of purchase, the approximate area, and the purchase price.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following statements which I have received from the Trinity House and the Commissioners of Irish Lights will give my hon. friend the information he desires:—

Statement No. 1:—Particulars of Sites acquired by the Trinity House during the last ten years for purposes connected with new Lighthouses.

Lighthouses.	Date acquired.	Price.	Area.	Remarks.
Lundy North -	Oct. 1899	Nil	2r. 28p. Right of way 490 yards	Old lighthouse site exchanged for new sites.
Lundy South -	Oct. 1899	Nil	1a. 1r. 0p. Right of way 380 yards	
Pendeen - -	Nov. 1899	£35	4a. 2r. 15p. Right of way 1,100 yards	
Jennington Point, River Thames	Jan. 1901	£75	100 square yards. Right of way 41 yards	
Tripcock Point, River Thames	Sept. 1901	2*s.* 6*d.* per annum	178 square yards. Right of way 38 yards	
Penlee - -	Oct. 1902	£500	1a. 0r. $18\frac{1}{2}$p. Right of way $1\frac{7}{8}$ mile	
Coldharbour, River Thames	Dec. 1903	£125	100 square yards. Right of way 33 yards	
Portland Bill -	July 1904	£890	Half an acre. Approach 520 yards. Right of way for sewer 72 yards	Valuable quarry land.
Berry Head -	Aug. 1906	£75	404 square yards. Right of way $1\frac{2}{5}$ mile	
Strumble Head -	June 1907	£400	$5\frac{3}{4}$ acres	An island.
Bideford Bar -	May 1908	£50	178 square yards. Right of way $2\frac{3}{4}$ miles	

Statement No. 2 :—Particulars of additional Land acquired by the Trinity House during the last ten years in connection with Lighthouses existing prior to this period.

Lighthouses.	Date acquired.	Price.	Area.	Remarks.
Foreland, Bristol Channel -	June 1899	£5	500 square yards	Extra land required to extend site to obtain satisfactory foundations for building.
Dungeness -	May 1903	£100	22 poles, and right of way 480 yards long	New site for low lighthouse.
Foreland, Bristol Channel -	Oct. 1905	£20	140 square yards	Site for magazine and hut for explosive fog-signal.
,, ,,	Aug. 1906	£3	385 square feet	Extra for ditto.
Flatholm - -	Oct. 1906	£150	Half an acre. Right of way 100 yards	For new siren fog-signal.
Blacknore -	Feb. 1908	£25	182 square yards	For establishment of a gas-holder in connection with improvement of light.
Lundy South -	Oct. 1908	£53	50 square yards	Extra piece of land required as part of site for automatic explosive fog-signal.

Commissioners of Irish Lights.

Return showing Sites acquired during past 10 years for purposes connected with the erection of new Lighthouses, but not including those acquired for Buoys, Beacons, or other purposes, giving names of Lighthouses, Date of Purchase, Approximate Area, and Purchase Price.

Name of lighthouse.	When site acquired.	Area approximately.	Purchase money or rent.
Blackhead - -	1900	2a. 2r. 37p.	£119 18*s.* 6*d.*
Barr Point -	1904	2a. 0r. 31p.	£33.
Inishtrahull -	1905	Not stated	1*s.* per annum for ever.
Mizen Head -	1908	30a. 1r. 2p.	£91 19*s.* 10*d.*
Sligo Lights -	1908	12 poles	£1 per annum. Term 99 years.

Flooding of Irish Rivers.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that serious and increasing injury is being done to tenant purchasers whose holdings lie alongside the small rivers and watercourses of Ireland by reason of the fact that the rivers are choked with weeds and invading the neighbouring lands; and whether the Government will bring the matter under the notice of the Estates Commissioners in order to see if anything can be done to provide against such flooding in the future.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In districts not under the control of a drainage board the cleansing of small watercourses would seem to be a matter for voluntary co-operation on the part of tenant purchasers. I am not aware that the Estates Commissioners have any powers in the matter, but I will consult them on the subject.

Women Clerks in the Foreign Office.

Mr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether there are any women clerks in the First or Second Division in his Department, and, if any, will he state the number in each division.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) There are no women clerks of the First or Second Division in the Foreign Office.

Persons Prosecuted for Corrupt Municipal Administrations.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask Mr. Attorney-General if he can state the number of persons during the past two years that have been successfully proceeded against in the London area for corrupt municipal administration, and the professions of such persons.

(*Answered by Sir William Robson.*) Twenty-two persons have been successfully prosecuted in the London district for corrupt municipal administration during the past two years, and at the present moment further cases of the same character affecting ten persons are pending. Of the twenty-two persons convicted, five were workhouse officials, three were contractors, and the remainder were mostly small tradesmen or persons in somewhat poor circumstances. One convicted person had been three times mayor of a Metropolitan borough, and another had been an alderman of the London County Council.

British Subjects and the Berne Copyright Union.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the hardship and loss which, by the adhesion of any country for the first time to the Berne Copyright Union, will be inflicted upon British subjects who, before such adhesion, may have purchased but not yet published manuscript arrangements of musical and other works originating in that country; whether the free publication in the United Kingdom of works so purchased has been provided for by the Berne Conference or otherwise; and, if not, whether he can take any steps to secure that British subjects shall not be deprived of rights which they have lawfully purchased by the action of any foreign Power.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Section 6 of the International Copyright Act, 1886, provides that where any person has before the date of the publication of an Order in Council lawfully produced any work in the United Kingdom, the issue of the Order shall not diminish or prejudice any rights or interests arising from or in connection with such production which are subsisting and valuable at the said date. A period of some months usually elapses between the definite adhesion of a new country to the Berne Convention and the publication of the consequent Order in Council in this country, and this interval would probably be sufficient to allow of the production of any work which may be existing in manuscript at the time, and any rights which may have been acquired by purchase or otherwise can thus be preserved.

Irish Agricultural Exports.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he will state the value of Irish exports in the years 1897 and 1907, respectively, of cattle, sheep, horses, bacon, eggs, and butter.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department have no information as to the value of exports in 1897. The following table shows the number of cattle, sheep, and horses exported from Ireland in the years 1897 and 1907 respectively, and the quantities of bacon, eggs, and butter exported in 1907, also the value of the exports in 1907:—

		Quantity.		Value.	
		1897.	1907.	1897.	1907.
Cattle -	No.	746,869	843,010	......	£ 10,419,430
Sheep -	No.	810,264	663,363		1,267,410
Horses -	No.	38,502	33,356		1,588,441
Bacon* -	Cwts.	No information	859,608*	No information	2,492,863*
Eggs -	Gt. hhds.	„	6,675,599		2,920,539
Butter -	Cwts.	„	818,004		4,008,220

* Not including Hams.

Postage Rates for Australian Newspapers.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster-General whether any arrangement has been entered into with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for the delivery of Australian newspapers in this country for 1d. postage on each newspaper weighing eight ounces; and whether a similar reduction in the postage rate of newspapers will be given from the United Kingdom to Australia.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative, and to the second in the negative.

Closing of Foreland Coastguard Station, Ventnor.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state on what date it was officially decided to withdraw the coastguard from the Foreland, Ventnor division.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The official authority for the closing of the station was given on the 24th November.

Payment of Salaries of Irish National School Teachers.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that inspectors of national schools in Ireland are paid their salaries monthly while the teachers frequently are not fully paid until the money is six months overdue, and then not directly; whether this is due to deficiency of staff or a bad system at head-quarters; whether he can promise that in future teachers will, like other public servants, be paid their salaries in full regularly and directly every month; and, if this be not done, whether the teachers will be paid interest on arrears of salary.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that inspectors of national schools are paid their salaries monthly. The teachers are paip punctually every quarter, and it is only when there are irregularities in the payment forms or claims of individual teachers that any delay takes place. Teachers cannot be paid monthly, as this would involve a very large increase of staff and a corresponding addition to the Vote. The Answer to the concluding portion of the Question is in the negative.

Indian Telegrams.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if he will state the number of words in telegraphic messages, and their value, despatched from India to places outside India during each year in 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907, distinguishing those from India itself and trans-Indian messages.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The reply is given in the following statement:—

	Messages sent from India.		Trans-Indian Messages.	
	Words.	Indian Value*	Words.	Indian Value*
		£		£
1903–4 - - -	3,009,365	45,777	4,121,200	54,898
1904–5 - - -	3,450,456	55,833	5,080,407	65,959
1905–6 - - -	3,491,616	52,759	5,119,111	68,459
1906–7 - - -	3 740,423	57,677	4,421,212	60,589
1907–8 - - -	3,997,327	61,848	4,561,908	61,933

* The figures in these columns show the sterling equivalent (at 1s. 4d. the rupee) of the Indian share of the receipts in respect of the messages, as shown in the Administration Report of the Indian Telegraph Department.

Evicted Tenants in County Westmeath.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will furnish a list of the *bona fide* evicted tenants (including representatives of deceased evicted tenants) in Westmeath whose claims are recognised by the Estates Commissioners as valid, but who have not yet been reinstated, showing, in connection with each, the date of eviction, name of the estate from which evicted, whether the evicted farm is now tenanted or not, the reason why not yet reinstated, the purpose of the Commissioners regarding the case, and when they expect to be able to carry out their purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) For the reasons which are fully stated in my reply to a Question asked by the hon. Member for North Armagh on the 8th July, 1907, I am not prepared to furnish the list in question.

Sale of the Estate of John H. Beinn of Creenelea.

MR. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the estate of John H. Beinn, of Creenelea, County Leitrim, has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners; and, if bought by the Estates Commissioners, will he explain why the agent of the landlord endeavours to collect rents or takes proceedings for recovery of same.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) No proceedings for the sale of the estate would appear to have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners.

Evicted Tenants in County Sligo.

MR. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of evicted tenants in the county of Sligo; how many of these are in occupation as caretakers; and how many evicted tenants in this country were reinstated or given new holdings during the five years ended the 1st November, 1908.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*): I am not in a position to say how many evicted tenants there are in County Sligo or how many of them are in occupation as caretakers. The Estates Commissioners inform me that of the persons who applied to them for reinstatement, as evicted tenants or the representatives of evicted tenants, thirteen have been reinstated or provided with other holdings, and the cases of twenty-eight others have been noted for consideration in connection with the allotment of untenanted land.

Completion of Sale of the Verschoyle Estate at Tanrago.

MR. McHUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether agreements for the purchase of the Verschoyle estate, at Tanrago, Beltra, County Sligo, were signed over twelve months ago; has the sale been completed; and, if not, will he state the cause of the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estate Commissioners inform me that the agreements referred to must have been provisional agreements indicating the terms at which the tenants would be prepared to purchase. The estate is pending for sale in the Court of the Land Judge, to whom the Commissioners have made an offer under Section 7 of the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Sale of the Hazelwood Demesne Estate of Owen Wynne.

MR. McHUGH: To ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how much money has been advanced by the Estate Commissioners for the Hazelwood demesne estate of Owen Wynne, in the rural district of Sligo; is it the practice of the Estates Commissioners to advance money for the sale of demesnes before advances are made for the purchase of the agricultural holdings on estates; what was the average number of years purchase paid by tenants on this estate who signed agreements; and how many tenants on the estate have refused or failed to sign agreements.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have advanced £79,378 for the purchase of the Hazelwood estate, of which £13,564 was advanced in respect of the demesne purchased under Section 3 of the Irish Land Act, 1903. It is not the practice of the Commissioners to advance the purchase-money payable in respect of a demesne before the advances are made for the purchase of the agricultural holdings on an estate. The purchase-money of the 120 holdings on this estate in respect of which advances were made represented an average of 23·9 years purchase. Purchase agreements were not signed in respect of six of the holdings.

Untenanted Lands on the Gore-Booth Estate.

MR. McHUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the purchase price for the estate sold to his tenants in the barony of Carbury, County Sligo, at Magherow and Ballintrillick, by Sir Jocelyn Gore-Booth, Baronet, has been advanced by the Estates Commissioners; is he aware that the untenanted land on this estate at Ballintrillick has been offered for sale by the vendor to the Estates Commissioners; how long have negotiations as to the price of the untenanted land been pending in this case; and will he request the Estates Commissioners to acquire these untenanted lands without further delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the purchase money of this estate has not been advanced. The untenanted lands have been inspected, and the Commissioners informed the owner in July last of their estimated price, but they cannot acquire the lands until the negotiations have been completed and the requirements of the statute have been complied with.

Fixing of Second-Term Rents on Joint Holdings.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is competent for joint tenants of a holding, who have had a fair rent fixed by the Court over fifteen years ago, to apply to the Court for the fixing of second-term rents separately on the holding against the wishes of the landlord, who desires the joint tenancy to continue.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to subsection 4 of Section 5 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896, which would appear to answer his Question in the negative.

Salaries and Allowances of County Inspectors, Royal Irish Constabulary, stationed in County Galway.

MR. HAZLETON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the salaries of the two county inspectors of the Royal Irish Constabulary at present stationed in County Galway; what allowances they received during the financial year, with the cost of the same; and what was the expense incurred by them in mileage and travelling.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The present salary of the county inspector of the East Riding of County Galway is £390 per annum, and that of the county inspector of the West Riding is £450 per annum. The annual allowances in each case are as follows:—lodging, £50; horse, £50; servant, £45; office, £18 5s.; stationery, £10; making a total of £173 5s. The accounts and vouchers showing the expenses incurred by these officers in 1907–8 for subsistence and travelling are before the Comptroller and Auditor-General. Tho figures are not therefore immediately available.

Charge for Extra Police.

MR. HAZLETON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the average cost of the entire force is taken into account in fixing the rate of charge for extra sergeants and constables in a county, and what bearing it has upon the cost of extra police drafted from one county to another; whether the only extra expenses incurred on account of drafting extra police from one county to another are travelling expenses, subsistence allowances, medical attendance where necessary, and barrack accommodation; and, if so, why is not the charge for such extra police based upon the average of these expenses exclusive of other considerations.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The manner in which the rates of charge referred to in the Question are to be determined is clearly laid down by Section 5 of the Constabulary (Ireland) Act, 1874, to which I would refer the hon. Member.

Acquisition of Lands of Aughacreira and Moydristian.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have acquired, or are about to acquire, the lands of Aughacreira and Moydristian, in the parish of Ballymachugh, County Cavan, the property of Mr. William Webb; what is the area of the lands mentioned; and, in view of the fact that the surrounding holdings are uneconomic, will this land be reserved for the evicted tenant on the estate and the small local tenant purchasers who recently signed purchase agreements.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have not acquired the lands referred to in the Question, but they have directed inquiries to be made with regard to the untenanted land owned by Mr. Webb. They are not at present in a position to give the further information asked for.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Contracts in Jarrow.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware of the nature of the distress due to unemployment now prevailing in Jarrow; and whether he will be able to place any Admiralty orders there at an early date.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): Messrs. Palmer of Jarrow have tendered for all the recent Admiralty contracts, but have not, up to the present been successful in obtaining an order. Tenders for machinery for a battleship and cruiser are now under consideration.

Navy Rum Supplies.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will grant a Return stating the total number of gallons of rum bought by his Department in each of the last three years; the date of each purchase; the number of gallons bought, and the price per gallon paid on each ocasion, and the marks and the names of the ships of the respective parcels involved in these various transactions; will he state whether the whole of these purchases were made by one firm of brokers without competition or tender; and, if so, what reason is adduced for this departure from ordinary procedure in obtaining supplies for a Government Department.

Mr. McKENNA: The quantity of rum purchased in London for the Navy in each of the three latest years to date, is as follows—

	Gallons.
1906	400,000
1907	120,000
1908	420,000

Prices and other particulars of Admiralty purchases of supplies of all commodities, are treated as confidential in the public interest, and it is not considered desirable to furnish the information asked for in the second and third parts of the Question. The whole of the purchases were made through one firm of brokers, who obtained offers in the open market without restriction of free competition. There was no departure from the ordinary trade procedure.

Mr. H. C. LEA: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Admiralty purchases of rum are carried out by one firm of brokers who accept only one kind—Demerara rum, and that the result of the purchase of large quantities is absolutely to dislocate the whole trade? Will he receive a deputation of people concerned in the market?

Mr. McKENNA: I should like notice of that Question.

Isle of Wight Coastguard Stations.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it has been decided to close the Foreland Detachment, Ventnor Division, of the Coastguard on 1st January; whether he is aware that all the men of that detachment have been in the habit of rendering assistance in the saving of life at sea, and whether he will postpone the carrying out of this and similiar reductions of the Coastguard until the House has had an opportunity of discussing them.

Mr. McKENNA: The detachment was closed as such on the 1st December, but, as stated yesterday, the same number of Coastguard men are retained there. The answer to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative, As I have stated before, the House will have an opportunity of discussing this question early next session, and in the meantime I do not propose to make any reduction of Coastguard stations which would take away Coastguard men from accustomed life-saving work.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Will these coastguard men be available at all times for life-saving service; and is it contemplated that they may be away from their signalling duties?

Mr. McKENNA: They will be just as available as before. Of course, they must not neglect their official duties.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH: Does the right hon. Gentleman recollect that last July he promised no further reductions should be made till next year?

Mr. McKENNA: No reductions that would entail a reduction of service for life-saving purposes; I adhere to that.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): How long is it since this detachment was reduced to three men?

Mr. McKENNA: I cannot say for certain, but, as far as I am aware, it has always consisted of three men.

Coastguard Conference Report.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the further Report of the Inter-Departmental Conference on the Coastguard has been received by the Admiralty and, if so, whether he proposes to make it public.

Mr. McKENNA: The Report has been received and is being dealt with in the Department. The question of publishing it will be considered when the Admiralty are in a position to make a statement upon their policy in the matter of the Coastguard.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): Shall we have an opportunity of considering the Report before the discussion of next year?

Mr. McKENNA: I cannot undertake to publish the Report. I must consider it.

Earl WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): On what grounds does the right hon. Gentleman refuse to publish the Report?

Mr. McKENNA: I have not refused; I have said the Admiralty are considering it.

Earl WINTERTON: But on what ground does the right hon. Gentleman refuse to give an undertaking to publish the Report?

Mr. McKENNA: Because at present it is under the consideration of the Admiralty.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of inviting the noble Lord to join the Coastguard?

[No Answer was returned.]

Wages on Admiralty Contracts at Portsmouth.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that Messrs. Morrison and Mason, at Portsmouth, have reduced their labourers' wages from 27s. 9d. per week to 23s. for fifty-six hours, such reduction taking place from 14th September; that they are also deducting from the men's wages 1½d. for tools and 1½d. for doctor; whether they have the consent of the Admiralty for such deductions; whether he is aware that some unions have claimed and been paid by the contractors the wages hitherto paid by the firm, viz. 6d. per hour; whether he is aware that in most towns the bricklayers' labourers' rate is taken as fair, which is always more than that paid on railways, whose wages for platelayers' labourers are invariably the lowest; and whether he is aware that the comparison cannot be made between these men who are casually employed and the dockyard men for whom his Department claim continuity of employment; whether he has obtained or asked for any information from any of the labour representatives of the trade unions in the district, and, if so, from whom, or whether the information has been obtained from the employers only; and, if so, would he supply a list of those employers.

Mr. McKENNA: The firm in question have not reduced labourers' rates, but the hours of work, which were fifty-five and a half per week in September, are at the present time forty-seven. The Admiralty is aware that a deduction is made of 2d. a week per man for medical attendance and 1d. a week for tools. The matter is one over which the Admiralty would have no control unless it could be shown that the deduction constituted an infraction of the Fair Wages Clause. With regard to the later points raised in the Question, I may remind the hon. Member that the terms of the Fair Wages Clause, as set out in the present contract, are as follows: "The wages paid in the execution of the whole of the work shall be those generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen in the district in which the work is carried out. This condition shall apply to all sub-contracts entered into by the contractor in connection with the said works, and the contractor shall procure the insertion of a provision to the same effect in any sub-contract." Upon a representation from the local Trades and Labour Council, the Admiralty, as I stated on Monday, instituted very full inquiry, and came to the conclusion that, on a review of all the circumstances, it could not be said that there had been any infraction of the Fair Wages Clause. I do not think I should be entitled to furnish the hon. Member with the list of employers for which he asks.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS: Can the right hon. Gentleman say at what date the hours were reduced from fifty-six to forty-seven? Has the right hon. Gentleman not had this case under consideration for three weeks, and can he give me no reply to the question whether unions have not claimed and some firms paid 6d. per hour?

Did not the hon. Member for Stoke-on-Trent successfully demand that in one case ?

MR. McKENNA : Yes, we have had the matter under consideration for three weeks, and the delay has been due to our desire to make the fullest possible inquiry into all the circumstances. I believe—but I am not sure—that the reduction of hours took place last September.

Oats for Army Horses.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover) : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state whether kiln-dried oats are allowed to be issued to Army horses.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington) : Kiln-dried oats are only allowed to be issued to Army horses provided that such oats fully comply with the contract specification in regard to quality, *i.e.*, that the oats must be good, sound, sweet, dry, clean, without any admixture of light or damaged oats, barley, peas, or other grains, and must weigh not less than 30 lbs. per imperial bushel, or in the case of clipped oats, 40 lbs.

CAPTAIN FABER : Is it not the fact that kiln-dried oats have generally been wet oats ?

MR. HALDANE : In anticipation of that Question, I have provided myself with the best opinions I could get, and I will read them. They are :—

Opinion of the Director of Supplies.—Oats grown in this country are kiln-dried only, I believe, when they have become damaged, in which case they would not come under our present specification as being "good, sound, and sweet," and would be rejected. Foreign oats, especially Russian, are frequently slightly kiln-dried to improve their keeping powers, and this process, if the oats are in good condition, is almost unobjectionable. It is extremely difficult to tell whether a sound oat has been kiln-dried or not, and it would be useless to put a condition into our specification that we could not prove.

Opinion of the Director-General, Army Veterinary Services.— Foreign oats are kiln-dried for safety in transit. Damaged oats are sometimes kiln-dried in order to effect sales. Kiln-drying is an absolutely harmless process. If the grain is damaged, it is chemical changes in the oats, and not kiln-drying which cause disease.

CAPTAIN FABER : But are not wet oats kiln-dried ? That is the point.

MR. FLAVIN : Is it not often very difficult to tell whether or not oats are kiln-dried ?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Inniskilling Dragoons.

CAPTAIN FABER : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what number of officers have been transferred to the Inniskilling Dragoons from other regiments since October, 1906 ; what special reason exists for transferring so many ; from what regiments were they transferred ; what the rank of each transferred officer was ; and whether, having regard to the hardship thereby inflicted, there is to be any relaxation of the rule whereby an officer has to retire in the event of his not having attained a certain rank by a certain age.

MR. HALDANE : Since October, 1906, seven officers have been brought into this regiment which contained a number of officers who had abnormally short service or were not qualified for promotion. Two captains were transferred, one being promoted to major, four lieutenants, one being promoted to captain, and one second lieutenant. These officers came one from 5th Dragoon Guards, two from Royal Artillery, and four from Northumberland Fusiliers. There is very little likelihood of any of the officers affected by these transfers having to retire for age, the senior captain having fourteen years in which to attain his majority and the lieutenants, other than those brought in, being also proportionately young for their positions.

EARL WINTERTON : In view of the wide difference of opinion that prevails on this subject, will the right hon. Gentleman recommend the Army

Council to issue a Memorandum dealing with the whole subject of the transfer of officers of the Line to cavalry regiments?

MR. HALDANE: These things must be decided entirely on the merits of the officers. I cannot say what the standard of qualification should be.

CAPTAIN FABER: Has not the character of the Inniskilling Dragoons been good?

MR. HALDANE: Oh, yes, excellent; but the difficulty arose from the number of officers with abnormally short service or not qualified for promotion.

CAPTAIN FABER: Would it not be better to put the whole service on an equality?

MR. HALDANE said the difficulty would not have arisen had the Inniskillings had their full *quota* of officers.

Soldiers as Boot-makers.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the date and year when his Department decided to teach soldiers the trade of Army boot-making; whether he can state how many are usually employed at this work, and how long does it take on the average to make them efficient and what is the usual price per pair of boots produced in this way.

MR. HALDANE: Action was taken on the recommendations of the Committee on the employment of Reserve and discharged soldiers and sailors in 1906. There is no attempt made to teach the trade in its entirety, but only, on the one hand, to give men who have a prior knowledge of the trade an opportunity to acquire further experiences by practising it in their leisure hours, and, on the other hand, to provide elementary instruction for men without such knowledge so that they may become familiar with the implements of the trade and be enabled to carry out repairs. No fixed number of men are under instruction, and no statistics exist to enable me to reply to the last two parts of the Question.

MR. H. C. LEA: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman see his way to give a certain number of men in every regiment an opportunity to learn a trade, so that when the time comes for their discharge they may not be driven into the ranks of the unemployed, after having devoted the best years of their life to the service of of their country?

MR. HALDANE'S reply was inaudible.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of instructing men in an elementary knowledge of the law, so that they may take up posts in the Law Courts?

MR. HALDANE: No, Sir.

MR. CROOKS: Why not?

Canadian Immigration—Glasgow Boiler-Makers' Grievance.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the fact that boilermakers have recently been engaged in Glasgow by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at specified wages, fare to Quebec being advanced by the Company but to be deducted from these wages; that the written agreements gave a definite engagement for three months, yet within two months these men were forcibly landed again at Liverpool; that when asked for the wages under the agreement, the Canadian Pacific Company, through their agents, W. A. Crump & Son, solicitors, London, deny liability; and, if so, will he say what steps the Colonial Office propose to take so that British subjects may not be thus illtreated and defrauded.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Secretary of State has no information as to the case referred to, but inquiry will be made.

Workington Conviction for Stealing Coal.

MR. CROOKS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of John James

Jelly, heard at the Workington Police Court on 25th November, who was proved to be in great poverty from unemployment and had a dying child, and that there was neither fire nor food in his house, who was sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment for stealing coal of the value of 2s. 2d., the defence being that he could not get a ticket for work and wanted the coppers to buy milk for his child; and will he take steps to reduce the sentence.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am making inquiries into this case, but they are not yet completed. I will let the hon. Member know the result.

MR. SWIFT MACNEIL (Donegal, S.): Why not telegraph for the information? This unfortunate man is suffering all the time.

Caledonian Railway—Owners' Risk.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the case connected with the fish trade of Aberdeen, where a wagon load of fish of about four tons, instead of being despatched when loaded by the Caledonian Railway Company to Glasgow, was shunted to a siding with empty wagons, resulting in a serious loss to the owner of the fish; if he is aware that the railway company disclaim any liability for the loss incurred; and if he will consider the desirability, in view of the frequency of such cases, of introducing next session a Bill dealing with owners' risk notes on the lines of the following Bills of private Members: Railway (Contracts), 1906, Railway Contracts, 1907, Railway and Canal Traffic Bill, 1908, one of which passed its Second Reading in this House.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): The Board of Trade have invited the observations of the railway company with regard to the particular consignment referred to, and have received a reply of which I am forwarding my hon. friend a copy. The question of the conditions under which traffic is carried at owners' risk is one that has been receiving the careful consideration of the Board, but I am not at present in a position to make any statement on the subject.

MR. PIRIE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that his predecessor in office three years ago called a meeting of chambers of commerce and traders of the country to discuss the whole question? Can the right hon. Gentleman hold out any hope of legislation for next year?

MR. CHURCHILL: I can say nothing as to the work of next year.

MR. PIRIE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this is a non-party question, and that the Bill which passed its Second Reading was introduced by an hon. Gentleman opposite?

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to reply that he was aware of that fact.

Seamen's Boarding Houses.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is now prepared to appoint a Commission to inquire into the state of seamen's boarding and lodging-houses, and the conditions under which they are conducted; and whether the Board appoints any officer or officers whose duty it is to see that such houses are conducted strictly in accordance with the licences and bye-laws of the local authorities in whose districts they are situated, in view of the fact that sailors and firemen while in port are compelled to lodge in a seamen's boarding or lodging-house.

MR. CHURCHILL: The inquiries referred to in the reply given by me to a Question put by the hon. Member on the 4th ultimo are not yet completed. On their completion, I shall not fail to consider whether any action or further investigation is required, and I shall be grateful if, in the meanwhile, the hon. Member will furnish me with any information he may have in regard to the state of seamen's lodging-houses which will assist me in arriving at a decision. The officers of the Board of Trade have access to licensed seamen's lodging-houses, but the responsibility for the proper control of such houses rests with the local authorities.

Manning of the Mercantile Marine.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that a boarding-house keeper was convicted by the deputy stipendiary magistrate at Cardiff on 20th November for having illegally supplied a crew of coloured men on 16th August last, when the British steamer "Cereda" was at the port of Swansea; whether he is aware that the boarding-house keeper, named Spooner, was engaged by the master or over-looker of the "Cereda" to supply the crew; whether he is aware that under Section 111, subsection (2), of the Merchant Shipping Act a person who employs an unlicensed person to engage or supply a crew is liable to a penalty of £20 for each seaman supplied in contravention of the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act; and whether, in view of the continued conviction of boarding-house keepers for illegal supply, he will say if it is the intention of the Board of Trade to take any proceedings against the persons who employ boarding-house keepers to contravene the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper—:

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the manning of the British steamer "Ashburton" of 4,445 tons gross; whether he is aware that the men constituting the deck hands were one Frenchman, two Norwegians, one Russian Finn, two Swedes, and two Danes, all of those men being engaged at the Port of Antwerp; whether he is aware that the stokehold hands were Chinamen, seventeen in number, twelve of these Chinese firemen producing no discharges and stating at the time of the engagement that they had previously served on German vessels; and whether he can state if the Board of Trade surveyor's attention was called to the manning of this ship prior to leaving a port in the United Kingdom; and what steps, if any, the Board of Trade intend to take to compel Chinese seamen to produce certificates of discharge at the time of their engagement in the same manner as British seamen are compelled to produce certificates of discharge before engagement.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the British steamer "Lord Derby," of 2,401 net registered tonnage and 3,757 tons gross, only carries six able seamen and one ordinary seamen; whether he is aware that when this vessel is at sea two of the able seamen and the one ordinary seaman are employed on day work, *i.e.*, to work on deck during the day and to be off duty the whole of the night, thereby reducing the effective deck watch during the night to one man steering, one man on the look-out for four hours each, and the officer in charge of the bridge, contrary to the regulations of the Board of Trade of 1897, which provide that in vessels of 800 tons gross there must be six effective deck hands; whether he is aware that the Advisory Committee of the Board of Trade on 13th October last recommended that vessels of 1,500 tons net should carry at least eight deck hands; and whether it is the intention of the Board of Trade to take any proceedings against the master of the "Lord Derby" for failing to maintain, when at sea, a proper and effective watch during the night.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can explain the cause in the delay in issuing the recommendations of the Advisory Committee of the Board of Trade with regard to the scheme of manning put forward by the Advisory Committee with reference to the number of men engaged in the deck department of British steamers, and also with reference to the efficiency of the deck hands; whether he is aware that in ports of Cardiff, Newport, and Barry qualified seamen are finding it difficult to obtain employment, whilst unqualified men are being engaged on board of British vessels; and whether, seeing the length of time which has elapsed since this question has had the attention of the Advisory Committee, he will take steps to see that the matter is dealt with by the Board of Trade at once.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what further inquiries have been held with regard to the deaths of five Asiatic seamen on board the British steamer "Strombus"; if he can state the reason why, when inquiry is alleged to have been held at Rotterdam with regard to the deaths of the men, the other members of the crew, apart from the officers, were not called upon to make statements as to the cause of the deaths of the Asiatics in question; and whether the Board of Trade are at present retaining the seamen who made serious allegations against the officers of this ship with regard to the alleged ill-treatment of the Asiatics.

MR. CHURCHILL: Inquiry is being made into the matters referred to in this and subsequent questions which stand in the name of my hon. friend on to-day's Paper, and I shall be happy to communicate the result to him in due course.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON: May we expect a reply at a very early date?

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not quite know how long it will take to make the inquiries, but I will do my best to accelerate the collection of the information, and will have it circulated with the votes if the hon. Member so desires.

Insurance Against Unemployment.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will lay a translation of the Report of an investigation by the German Imperial Statistical Office into the feasibility of insurance against unemployment, undertaken in conformity with a Resolution of the Reichstag.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Report referred to by my hon. friend, which was published in 1906, is a very large one, consisting of 1,470 folio pages in three volumes. It discusses in great detail all the various experiments made in different countries for the insurance of workpeople against unemployment, but it does not attempt to formulate any proposals. The Report was reviewed at some length in the Board of Trade *Labour Gazette* of August, 1906. Information upon this subject was published by the Board of Trade in the Report on Agencies and Methods for dealing with the Unemployed in foreign countries [Cd. 2304 of 1904); and I understand that the Poor Law Commission will also publish a Memorandum, which practically brings that Report up to date as regards this subject. In the circumstances mentioned it does not seem necessary to undertake the lengthy and expensive task of translating the German volumes. They are, however, open to the inspection of the hon. Member at any time.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the great decrease in the number of young persons in secondary schools who at the present moment are learning German, and will he take steps——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. That has nothing whatever to do with the Question on the Paper.

Wages and Old-Age Pensions.

MR. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will say if, in the case of a man earning £31 10s. a year when over the age of seventy years, the wages may be divided for pension purposes, and so enable both his wife and himself to secure the old-age pension.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am advised that the effect of subsections (1) and (2) of Section 4 of the Old-Age Pensions Act is that the means of a person, being one of a married couple living together in the same house, must be calculated in the same way as the means of a person who is not married, viz., as the amount received or enjoyed by him or her individually, with this exception, that the means of such a person must not be taken as being less than half the joint means of the couple. Hence, if the husband's means are £31 10s. a year, and the means of the wife are nil, the husband's means must be taken at £31 10s. a year and the wife's at not less than £15 15s. a year. The husband would thus be entitled to a pension of 1s. per week, and the wife to a pension of 5s. per week.

MR. CROOKS asked if the right hon. Gentleman had not made a mistake. Had not the £31 to be divided between the two, and would not each be entitled to 5s. a week?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have not made a mistake. I think it better to confine these Answers to the Law Officer's opinion, which I have now read out.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: If the income of the man is £31 10s. where does the woman's £15 come from? That is the whole point.

[No Answer was returned.]

Relief Works and Disfranchisement.

MR. CURRAN (Duaham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether men who are employed during this winter on relief works under poor law guardians will be penalised by disfranchisement.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I presume my hon. friend refers to cases in which men receive relief from the guardians and are set to work as a condition upon which the relief is given. In such a case the recipient of the relief would be disfranchised. Of course, where the guardians carry out works and persons are employed for that purpose at wages in the ordinary way, these persons are not disfranchised.

MR. CURRAN: Was it the intention of the Prime Minister to remove disabilities from people who are employed this winter by boards of guardians in stoneyards?

MR. JOHN BURNS: It is well within the recollection of the House that the Prime Minister's pledge and promise, which has been kept, applied to all workmen who were employed through distress committees and not by boards of guardians.

MR. CURRAN: Will those who are employed for a temporary period this winter in stoneyards under boards of guardians be disfranchised?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes; I believe they would be.

Inspection of Fever Hospitals.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any independent inspection is made by his Department of fever hospitals managed by public corporations; and, if not, will he see that such inspections are instituted, in view of the fact that the public have necessarily less opportunity of judging of these than in the case of general hospitals.

MR. JOHN BURNS: A fever hospital provided by a local authority would not be inspected by a medical inspector of the Local Government Board in the ordinary course. The responsibility for the proper administration of such a hospital rests with the local authority, though, in some instances, where there has been complaint of mal-administration the Board have caused an investigation to be made. Moreover, where the district of a sanitary authority is inspected by a medical inspector, he would include the hospital of the authority in his inspection. It does not seem to me necessary that any change should be made in the practice in this matter.

MR. WATT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a number of these fever hospitals were recently found to be in a very unsatisfactory state?

MR. JOHN BURNS: If the hon. Member will give me information I shall only be too pleased to break through the rule and send a medical inspector at once.

Betting Temptations for Post Office Employees.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether a Post Office sorting clerk at Walsall is now being prosecuted for an alleged attempt to obtain money fraudulently from a betting agent in Flushing; whether this agent has an English address and was prosecuted by the Crown, and, on being convicted, appealed; whether he dropped the appeal; and whether the Post Office can do anything to prevent him from still carrying on his business through it, and so placing special temptations before Post Office servants.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): A sorting clerk and telegraphist at Walsall has been prosecuted recently for unlawfully attempting to obtain £5 by false pretences from a betting agent at Flushing.

Secondary School and Training College Regulations.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he intends the education settlement to be produced by the Education Bill to include a settlement of the difficulties that have arisen in the last three years in regard to secondary schools and training colleges; and, in particular, whether, in that event, he intends to make the requisite modifications in the secondary schools and training colleges regulations so that denominational schools and colleges shall receive grants from the Board of Education equivalent to the grants for those provided by the local authority, as will be the case in regard to elementary schools under the settlement embodied in the Bill.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): The various points referred to by the hon. Member do not arise under the Education Bill, which deals only with elementary education. If the Bill now under discussion is passed, the position of Nonconformists and others who are now under disabilities in other parts of the public educational system will, no doubt, be affected thereby, but the hon. Member's Questions are hypothetical, and it would be premature for me to give him a definite reply at present.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): That does not really answer my hon. friend's Question. Are these training colleges and denominational schools to be treated differentially, according to the religious instruction given, or will they henceforth be treated alike as before the year 1907?

MR. TREVELYAN: I cannot add anything to my right hon. friend's Answer.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): Are we to understand that this part of the education question is to remain unsettled?

MR. TREVELYAN: I do not think so.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I will put another Question to-morrow.

Walworth Catholic and Council Schools.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state, in shillings, what are the present grants per child made from taxes by his Department and from rates by the local authority to the Catholic school at Rodney Road, Walworth, and what are the similar grants per child to council schools in Walworth, and if he can state what are the annual salaries of the head and assistant teachers in this Catholic school and in the Walworth council schools; and whether he can estimate by how much the salaries of the Walworth Catholic teachers will be reduced if the grant from rates is withdrawn.

MR. TREVELYAN: The grants from the Board of Education, in respect of the school named, amount to 38s. per child, and the average grant, in respect of all the council schools in Walworth, amounts to 37s. 8d. per child. I have no information as to the amount spent by the local education authority from sources other than Government grant in respect of the particular school named, or of the council schools in Walworth. The school at Rodney Road is in three departments. The average salary of the head teacher is, I believe, £154 odd, and the average salary of the assistant teachers of various grades is £88 odd; the average salary of the head teachers in the various council schools in Walworth is £241, and of the assistant teachers £122 odd. I have no means of knowing the Answer to the concluding paragraph of the Question.

Attendance in Catholic Schools.

Mr. C. J. O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that, although the average attendance at Catholic schools in England and Wales is only about 300,000 children, the accommodation in them is for 412,669 children; whether, in consequence of the slackness of the local education officials, the attendance is generally slack in Catholic schools; whether the number of children on the rolls is nearly 400,000; and whether he is aware that, including Scotland, nearly 500,000 of Catholic children of school age in Great Britain are about to be deprived of grants from the rates, to which their parents contribute; and what steps the Government proposes to take to safeguard this body of future citizens from being placed in a position of permanent educational inferiority and inefficiency.

Mr. TREVELYAN: The average attendance in Roman Catholic schools for the last year for which figures are available was 286,188, and the recognised accommodation was 406,137. I have no reason to suppose that the attendance in Roman Catholic schools is generally slack. The average number on the books in Roman Catholic schools in 1906–7 was 333,403. With regard to the last paragraph, so far as England and Wales are concerned, I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Education Bill now before the House.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Are we to understand that the average attendance of pupils in Roman Catholic schools compares favourably with the average attendance of children attending other denominational and undenominational schools?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I do not think it compares unfavourably, but I can get the figures if notice of the Question is given.

Mr. MYER (Lambeth, N.): How many Catholic children are in attendance in Council schools?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am afraid I cannot answer that without notice.

Religious and Moral Instruction.

Mr. G. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the term religious instruction in Section 1, subsection (2) (*b*), of the Elementary Education Bill includes systematic moral instruction, whether derived wholly from Biblical sources or not.

Mr. TREVELYAN: The point raised in the hon. Member's Question seems to suggest too fine a distinction for ordinary persons who are not theologians to grasp; but so far as I understand what the hon. Member desires in the way of moral instruction, I do not see why any difficulty need arise in regard to it under the Bill.

Mr. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): Does the hon. Gentleman think that Section 1 of the Bill can be carried out without instituting a credal register?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I do not think that that arises out of the Question.

Mr. W. THORNE: Surely it does.

Religious Instruction Syllabus.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if it is intended that the three-quarters of an hour specified in Clauses 1 and 2 of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill may be occupied in part by the religious observances, viz., the hymn and the prayer, or, additionally, the reading of a passage from the Bible, which at present usually form part of the proceedings of a school during the period assigned to religious education; and, if so, will he take steps to make that clear, either in the text of the Bill or by an article in the Day School Code.

Mr. TREVELYAN: So far as I understand what it is that the hon. Member wishes to be allowed to take place in the schools, I doubt whether any alteration need be made in the Bill; but I will consider the point.

Teachers and the Fair Wages Clause for Contracting-out Schools.

Mr. YOXALL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if the Fair Wages Clause, invariably inserted in Government contracts, is to be applied to the employment of teachers in contracting-out schools under Clause 3 of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill; and, if so, will he make that clear by amending the text of the Bill accordingly.

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am considering in what way it can most satisfactorily be provided in the Bill that the teachers in contracting-out schools shall receive adequate remuneration, to the satisfaction of the Board of Education, regard being had to the rate of salaries paid by local education authorities to teachers in other public elementary schools.

Appeals Against the Allocation of School Grants.

Sir HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in the allocation of grants by an association, formed under Section 3 of the Education Bill, to public elementary schools affiliated to it, any appeal will be allowed from the managers of a school dissatisfied with the proposed grant to the Board of Education, as under the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897.

Mr. TREVELYAN: No, Sir.

Education Associations.

Sir HENRY KIMBER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education how the new associations under Clause 3 of the Education Bill are to be constituted; and will the denomination have full power to form an association as it thinks best or will it be compelled as under the Voluntary Schools Act of 1897, to propose a scheme of constitution for the approval of the Board of Education, whose decision shall be final.

Mr. TREVELYAN: The constitution of the association will be determined by the denominations, but will be subject to the approval of the Board of Education.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): Will members of the High, Low, and Broad Church parties be regarded as one denomination or be allowed to have separate associations?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The Church of England will have one association.

Lord EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester): Will there be any appeal against the decision of the Board of Education?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I would rather leave that till the clause is under consideration.

Lord EDMUND TALBOT: But we are under the guillotine.

Mr. TREVELYAN: If the hon. Gentleman is dissatisfied, I think he might put down a Question to my right hon. friend.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Will time be given by the Government on the later stages of the Bill to define more clearly the position of the associations?

Mr. TREVELYAN: That is a question for discussion when we come to Clause 3.

Richmond Park.

Sir HENRY KIMBER: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if he will state by whose order and under what authority a portion of Richmond Park is being converted into a nursery garden with pits, entirely altering its character and affecting the amenities of surrounding private residences; and whether he will take steps to obviate or lessen the deterioration which is going on.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. L. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): A portion of an outlying paddock in Richmond Park is being made into a nursery under my directions. It is absolutely necessary that this nursery should be made in order to provide the shrubs which are required for the Royal Parks. When the initial work is completed I do not think it will be found that the amenities of the houses surrounding the park will be affected.

Mr. WATT: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether the occupiers of these private residences in the park pay rates towards the upkeep of the park?

Mr. L. HARCOURT: I cannot say as to that.

Mall Improvement.

Mr. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the archway which is now being built in the Mall, over the footway leading to Birdcage Walk, is part of the original scheme for the improvement of the Mall, and if it is intended to build any other white stone arches in St. James's Park.

Mr. L. HARCOURT: No archway is being built over the footpath. The gates form part of the Queen Victoria Memorial scheme for the completion of the Mall. It is not proposed to build any arches in St. James's Park.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): Out of what fund is the money being provided?

Mr. L. HARCOURT: Out of the Queen Victoria Memorial Fund.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Have any turf or trees been lost by putting up these pillars and gates?

*Mr. L. HARCOURT: Yes. One thorn tree, which I am convinced was dying, has been removed under my direction.

Sheriff Clerks in Scotland.

Mr. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the system of paying sheriff clerks in Scotland is to hand over to them a lump sum from which the sheriff clerks pay their staffs; that no cognisance is taken by the Treasury of how much is paid to sheriff clerk-deputes or to clerks serving under them; that the distribution of this money might often be inequitable without the Treasury becoming aware of it; and, if so, whether he will see the advisability of having the staffs of all the sheriff clerks in Scotland directly associated with the Treasury, with their salaries paid thence, or otherwise that the Treasury take cognisance of the manner in which the lump sums are distributed, so that merit and length of service may always be recognised with fairness.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): Sheriff clerks in Scotland receive, as a rule, in addition to fixed salaries, lump sum allowances for payment of deputes and clerks, but in some cases the salaries also include allowances. The Treasury do not ordinarily take cognisance of the distribution of an allowance, unless a question arises of the necessity for varying the total amount, but receipts for amounts paid to deputes and clerks are furnished to the King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer as well as to the Comptroller and Auditor-General. A system of this kind is common to several branches of the public service, and I see no reason for altering the present arrangements.

The Weir Trust.

Sir HENRY KIMBER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Barnstaple division, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether, and when, the Charity Commissioners propose to seal the scheme they are preparing respecting the diversion of the trust fund bequeathed by the late Mr. Benjamin Weir, of Streatham; whether they will afford the Member for Wandsworth and the inhabitants of Streatham, in the borough of Wandsworth, a final opportunity of perusing it before it is actually sealed; and whether they will postpone the carrying out of the scheme until such time as the matter can be debated on some Vote in Supply next session.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): The Commissioners propose to seal the scheme on Tuesday next. I will send the hon. Baronet a copy of the scheme to-night. In answer to the last part of the Question, the scheme will be carried out in the ordinary course.

Sir HENRY KIMBER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the Charity Commissioners, a body entrusted by Parliament with the performance of specific and statutory duties and paid for the same, are proposing, greatly in excess of the powers conferred upon them by Parliament, to divert a trust fund, bequeathed by the late Mr. Benjamin Weir, of Streatham, to found a medical charity within and for the benefit of the inhabitants of Streatham, in the borough of Wandsworth, to other purposes altogether in another parish and another borough; whether he will direct the attention of the Attorney-General to the subject; and whether he will cause the carrying out of the scheme proposed by the Commissioners to be postponed until such time as the matter can be debated on some Vote in Supply next session.

Mr. SOARES (on behalf of the Prime Minister): The statements contained in the first part of the Question are evidently based on incorrect information, and a misapprehension of the nature of the trust. There would be no useful purpose in directing the attention of the Attorney-General to the subject at the present time. The Answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

Cambridgeshire Small Holdings.

Mr. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he has received any communication from applicants for small holdings at Coates, Cambridgeshire, complaining that the Isle of Ely County Council have not taken steps to provide them land, although the men have sent repeated applications since last January; that recently the small holdings committee have refused to recognise the applications from the Co-operative Small Holdings Association; if he has been asked to send an inspector to Coates to make inquiry into the case; have the applicants urged the Board to exercise their powers under the Act to acquire land for these men; and what steps do the Department intend to take in the matter.

The TREASURER of the HOUSEHOLD (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.): The facts are as stated, and the Board are in communication with the county council on the subject.

Scottish Secondary Schools.

Mr. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in view of the fact that the total number of children in average attendance at secondary schools in Scotland for the year 1904–5 was 16,688 and that they received grants of public money amounting in all to £70,496 11s. 10d., he will explain upon what principle grants to the amount of £80,690 14s. 3d. were given to these same schools for the year 1906–7 when the number of children had only increased by 240, making a total of 16,928; and whether this increased grant of £10,000 is reasonable, as it amounts to £40 per child in increased average attendance.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): The particulars of grants paid to secondary schools in the year 1906–7, as given on page 41 of the Report on Secondary Education, comprise a number of payments made in respect of two years, as explained in a footnote. The figures given by the hon. Member do not make allowance for this fact and therefore require considerable modification. Apart from this, however, the amounts of these grants were not determined by average attendance. They were derived from three sources, two of which provide fixed sums to be distributed annually as nearly as may be in their entirety for the benefit of secondary scohols. The grants for science and art paid by the Department, which formed the third source of income of these schools, were determined by the amount and quality of the work done.

Lawlessness in the West of Ireland.

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government sent Mr. Horne, late resident magistrate, to the West of Ireland to report upon the condition of that part of the country, especially in regard to lawlessness; and, if so, will they lay the Report of Mr. Horne upon the Table.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): As stated in my reply to a Question asked by the hon. and gallant Member for

East Down on 4th March last, Mr. Horne was employed in County Galway for ten days in the month of January last. His communication to the Government was of a strictly confidential nature, and will not be published.

Cahirciveen District Council and Fairs.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the terms of the resolution passed by the Cahirciveen Rural District Council on the 11th ultimo. to the effect that it is advisable that rural district councils should have equal powers with urban councils to regulate the holding of fairs and markets; and whether he proposes to give effect to this resolution.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention has been called to the resolution referred to. Under Section 1 of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1896, a rural district council can be invested by the Local Government Board with the powers of an urban authority for any of the purposes of the Public Health Acts. Under those Acts urban authorities have certain powers with regard to markets, and the Board are prepared to consider an application from the rural district council to be invested with such powers.

Saurine Estate, Tipperary.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet advanced the cash for the purchase of the Saurin Estate, Lisballyard, County Tipperary; and, if not, what is the cause of the delay.

MR. BIRRELL: This estate will be dealt with by the Estates Commissioners in its order of priority. Its turn has not yet been reached.

Irish Land Purchase Compulsory Powers.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland which clause of the Irish Land Bill restricts or limits the power, conferred upon the Land Commission by Clause 31, of acquiring land compulsorily outside the congested districts area; and whether it is intended that this power of compulsory purchase is to be exercised solely for the purpose of dealing with cases of congestion.

MR. BIRRELL: Clause 44 of the Bill contains general restrictions on the compulsory acquisition of land under the Bill. Clause 31, which lays down the procedure to be adopted by the Land Commission preliminary to compulsory acquisition, is limited to land which is not situated in a congested districts county. The power of acquiring such land is not confined to cases of congestion, but doubtless the most urgent cases of this kind would be the first to be dealt with by the Land Commission.

Rosse Estate Evicted Tenant.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps have been taken by the Estates Commissioners to reinstate an evicted tenant named Rose Egan on the property of Lord Rosse at Clonlyon Castle, King's County, the agent having told Rose Egan that he was willing she should be reinstated by the Commissioners.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that this holding has been inspected and that they have intimated to the owner the price which they are willing to advance for the purchase of the evicted farm, provided the evicted tenant is reinstated and signs a purchase agreement.

Marsham Estate Evicted Tenant.

MR. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any steps to reinstate Mrs. Anne McHugh, an evicted tenant on the Marsham estate, Killavoggy, County Leitrim, she having signed the necessary agreement for purchase in May last and for the preservation of the plantations, in compliance with the terms of the Commission; and whether, having regard to the fact that the young plantation on the farm was being destroyed, the Commissioners would take immediate action to have her reinstated.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have had the lands inspected and have intimated to the owner the price which they are prepared to advance for the purchase of the evicted farm. It is understood that the owner is about to reinstate Mrs. McHugh, who has agreed to purchase.

Irish Equivalent Grants.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish Development Grant was made to Ireland as an equivalent of the increased education grants to England and Wales under the Education Act of 1902; and whether he is able to state the amount which Ireland should receive as the equivalent of the increased grants to English and Scottish education, under Acts subsequent to 1902 or contemplated under the Education Bills now before Parliament.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. With respect to the first part of the Question I would refer the hon. Member to a reply given by my predecessor to the hon. Member for West Kerry on 14th March last. I will send him a copy. As regards the last part of the Question I am not aware of any reason for increasing the grants for education in Ireland, in connection with the English Education Bill or otherwise, as practically the whole cost of elementary education in Ireland is already borne on Votes of Parliament.

Mr. LONSDALE: Has not the equivalent grant to Scotland been largely increased?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: If the hon. Member will give me notice I will inquire.

Kingstown Pier Dispute.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that, since 1st April last, the steamers of the London and North-Western Railway Company have been using the Carlisle Pier, Kingstown Harbour, without making any payment for the use thereof, while the only other steamers allowed to use this pier are the mail steamers of the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company, which has to pay a sum of £2,000 per annum for the use of this pier, he will state on what grounds the Treasury charge an Irish company this heavy annual sum for the accommodation provided, while, at the same time, they allow an English Company to use the pier without any payment; and if he can state how long it is intended to discriminate against an Irish company in this manner.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. The amount paid by the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company is £182 5s., not £2,000 per annum. The amount to be paid by the London and North-Western Railway Company has not yet been decided, pending a decision on the legal questions which have been raised by the City of Dublin Company.

Mr. MOONEY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that under the contract between the City of Dublin Company and the Postmaster-General, the Postmaster-General stops a sum of £500 per quarter out of the passenger receipts of the Company for the use of this pier, and whether that does not amount to a charge of £2,000 per annum for the use of the pier? Am I to understand that because there is an action between the company and another Department in connection with the interpretation of the contract that is considered a reason for allowing another person to come in and use the pier free of charge?

Mr. HOBHOUSE said the facts were as stated in his reply.

Mr. MOONEY: Will the hon. Gentleman cause a copy of the contract to be placed before him so that he may see whether it is not a fact that £500 per quarter is taken out of the passenger receipts of the company and paid over to the Treasury? Are we to understand that in addition to that there is an annual sum charged by way of rent?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: No. I am not aware of that. I understand that 5s. per trip is charged and that this sum averages £182 5s.

MR. MOONEY: The hon. Gentleman is quite wrong, and I will put down another Question so that he may see it.

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND QUESTIONS.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): May I ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that eight Questions were to-day put to the Minister for Education relating to the Bill now being discussed under the Closure Resolution as to some of which the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board stated he could not take the responsibility of answering, and whether the Prime Minister is aware that the Answers to some of these Questions are of crucial importance in forming a right judgment upon the policy of the Bill, and will he be good enough to make arrangements—I know there are difficulties—that the Minister for Education, or some responsible Minister, shall be present at Question-time during the progress of this Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): There is no man in this House who, at this moment, is so hardly worked. I believe I am not exaggerating when I say that he has not had twenty-five minutes to-day to himself. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board was present, and he answered the Questions, but he refused to answer some Supplementary Questions. Under the circumstances this treatment of the Under-Secretary is somewhat ungenerous.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of withdrawing the Education Bill in view of the result of the Chelmsford election?

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL. [LORDS.]

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL. [LORDS.]

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL. [LORDS.]

Report from the Joint Committee in respect of the Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords] (pending in the Lords), with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 343.]

DEBTORS (IMPRISONMENT).

Report from the Select Committee brought up, and read [Inquiry not completed].

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 344.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 344.]

EDUCATION BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 2:

*MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes) said that when he was interrupted by the adjournment of the Committee last night he was in process of moving the omission of the words "on two mornings in the week in which school meets," with the result that if the omission were accepted the opportunities given to a child of receiving denominational religious instruction would not be confined to two mornings in the week. He had been refreshing his memory by reading the report of what was said on the subject yesterday by the Prime Minister, who told them that the right of entry was not to be confined to two days a week, but that no individual child would be at liberty to receive denominational teaching on more than two days a week. It appeared to many of them that that was a very meagre allowance. He would ask hon. Members opposite to remember that they had conceded the principle that children were to have the opportunity of receiving denominational teaching in all schools, and they had also conceded that the presence of denominational teachers was not to be restricted to two days a week. Then what reason could there be for preventing children from receiving religious education in accordance with the wishes of their parents on more than two days in the week? He had never upheld the extreme denominational point of view, because he believed that religious teaching of value to the children, so far as it went, could be imparted under the Cowper-Temple Clause. Although he thought that religious teaching of value to children was possible, and was given in some schools under the Cowper-Temple Clause, yet he did not ignore the fact—they had all got to recognise the fact—that there was a large body of people in the country who took the contrary view, conscientiously and honestly believing that such teaching, if not harmful, was absolutely valueless. They might not be able to understand that view, but those who held it had a perfect right to it, and it was perfectly certain that that view was honestly held. No man had a right to dictate to another man what should be his views in this connection, where deep religious convictions were concerned. No suggestion could be more illiberal. And so, if they were to have a settlement, one fact must be recognised by the hon. Gentlemen opposite, and it was an important fact in connection with this provision for the right of entry. What had been the chief complaint of the Nonconformists in connection with their opposition to the Bill of 1902? What had impelled them to passive resistance? It was that they had been forced, and they said it was an insupportable injustice, to pay for religious teaching of which they did not approve. How did they propose to remedy this state of affairs under the Bill? And here was the fact which he wished to impress upon them. They proposed to remedy it by shifting the same grievance, which by their own admission had been intolerable, on to other shoulders; they proposed to remedy it by compelling others to pay for religious teaching of which those others did not approve. And when hon. Gentlemen opposite said that this was not a balanced settlement, that the concessions did not balance, that the sacrifice required by the Church was small, he would ask them to recall to their minds the violent terms in which they had characterised that bondage which, under this Bill, they were now light-heartedly seeking to impose on others. How came it that anyone with a sense of justice was willing to discuss or entertain for a moment this solution which would appear to be so obviously unjust? It was only because it was hoped that the *quid pro quo*, the right of entry into all schools, would be no shadowy concession, but a concession of a substantial and really valuable nature. He had to admit that he was speaking from the point of view of members of the Church of England. This concession of right of entry was no good to Roman Catholics, and in this sense, from their point of view, the solution was most unsatisfactory. Returning to the English Church point of view, it appeared to him that under this Bill, whereby children whose parents so desired were to have one-and-a-half hour's denominational religious teaching in the week, the right of entry as a concession was lacking in substance. They had conceded the right of entry, and, the principle once conceded, was it not politic from every point of view to be ungrudging in the application of that principle? There was another matter. Many of them were strangers to some of the fears which were entertained by extremists in connection with this Bill, but if they were to allay those fears—if they were to get a lasting settlement—they must endeavour to understand those fears, and must give consideration to those hypothetical cases which were suggested by extremists in all sincerity, even if the possibility of such cases occurring might seem to them very remote. Under the Bill, as he had said, the children of parents so desiring were to have denominational instruction for two periods of three-quarters of an hour in the week. What if the headmaster of the school was a man of forceful character, and for one reason or another was strongly antagonistic to the denominational teaching in his school, or to the teacher thereof? If not a probability, was it not a possibility that he might set himself in the remaining three days of the week to give religious teaching to put it mildly, in no sense in sympathy with the denominational teaching? Was it not possible that he might set himself in the remaining three days to counteract this teaching? It might be said that it was not probable, but none could say that it was impossible, and how disagreeable would be the position. It might be asserted that the parent would have his remedy in the withdrawal of his child from the Cowper-Temple teaching under the conscience clause, but the result of this would be that the child would be penalised by receiving only one and a half hour's religious instruction in the week, a very meagre allowance. He submitted that his Amendment alone would solve such difficulty. The Prime Minister yesterday said that the Bible-teaching given in Church schools on three days a week was an excellent basis on which to superimpose Church teaching, and further, that it had been an almost universal system in Church of England schools to give three days ordinary Bible-teaching, and on the remaining two days distinctive denominational teaching, and that it had worked well. Yes, it had worked well where all religious teaching had been given by the same teacher, or under the same superintendence, but it must be remembered that in future this religious instruction in the schools was to be given by two independent teachers. They were not allowed to inquire into the religious opinions of the headmaster before he was appointed, and they did not know what his religious views might be, or what might be his qualifications even for giving the teaching which it was his duty to give, under the Bill, under the Cowper-Temple clause, and under those circumstances was it not possible that the two teachers of religion in the school might be teaching one against the other? Everyone in that House, he thought, would agree that that would be a most deplorable position. The Prime Minister said yesterday that Cowper-Temple teaching was an excellent basis on which to superimpose Church teaching. Yes, but what security had they that Cowper-Temple teaching as now given in the schools would endure? What guarantee was there that in the future it would not be supplanted by religious teaching absolutely valueless, and even pernicious in their eyes? Who knew what Governments might be in power in the future? Was it absolutely impossible that they should see something as uninspiring to children as the New Theology, or perhaps, ethical teaching with strong socialistic tendencies, installed in the schools as the State idea of what religious teaching should be? At all events, with the possibility of the future before them, they had a right to ask that the benefits to be conceded by the right of entry should be real and substantial benefits. He would detain the House no longer; as he had already said, the Government and their Nonconformist supporters had conceded the principle of the right of entry, and he most earnestly appealed to them to apply this principle ungrudgingly by accepting his Amendment, because it would only make for peace. He believed the acceptance of the Amendment would do more to pacify a large body of Churchmen than any Amendment which was not contrary to the principle of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out from the word 'instruction,' to the word 'make,' in line 27."—(*Mr. Mildmay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'on' stand part of the clause."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said he understood the hon. Member's Amendment was directed to the time-limit of two mornings a week, although he had argued beyond that point. The two mornings a week which were provided for by the clause represented, not any arbitrary time picked on by the Government as being what the framers of the Bill thought sufficient, but a time which, by almost universal consent, had been found adequate by those desirous of giving denominational instruction in the schools. Denominational instruction did not cover the whole ground of religious instruction, even in denominational schools. He was quite sure that hon. Members opposite, so far as Protestants were concerned—he said nothing about those of the Roman Catholic faith—would recognise that the teaching ordinarily given as Cowper-Temple teaching was in a large part such as was also ordinarily given as religious instruction in denominational schools, but it was not the whole of the religious instruction given in denominational schools, and was therefore defective in that respect. But whatever the differences between the different Protestant denominations might be, there was a considerable amount of religious instruction which was common to all. They all knew that in Church schools and undenominational schools the Bible was taught very much on the same lines, and therefore that teaching was common to both the denominational and the undenominational schools as at present constituted. But, dealing only with the catechetical teaching, it had been found sufficient in practice in the denominational schools to confine that catechetical teaching practically to half an hour on two mornings in the week, and in many schools on only one morning in the week. Why had that been done? Not because the State put any limit upon the time; nor because the teacher who gave religious instruction was in any way stinted by the authorities. Not at all. It was found that half an hour of catechetical teaching on two mornings a week was adequate for the purpose, and perhaps would give as much as a child of tender years could conveniently assimilate. The denominational schools had themselves made the limit, and the Government had, therefore, adopted it. He would not like to speak as to the course of the negotiations between the exalted persons whose names had been raised in that debate and his right hon. friend, because he could not speak with anything like authority, but he thought he would be right in saying, from what had appeared in the public Press, that those who had assumed to act on behalf of the Church in all these arrangements had not made any very strenuous claim for more time than that which was given in the Bill. He did not know that they had made any claim for more time, but if they had made any, certainly it had not forced its way——

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): So far as the published correspondence goes, no one has assumed to act on behalf of the Church.

Sir W. ROBSON said he did not think he was contending that anybody had acted on behalf of the Church. He said they were assumed to act on behalf of the Church, and he thought the noble Lord himself not infrequently assumed to act on behalf——

Lord R. CECIL: Never.

Sir W. ROBSON said that at any rate the noble Lord had spoken on behalf of the Church there and had assumed a degree of almost pontificial authority, and one might allow, therefore, some authority to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. They at all events did not seem to have laid any very great stress or insistence upon the extension of the proposed time, and under those circumstances he thought they might fairly adopt the existing usage and stand by it. The mover of the Amendment went further, in his speech, than the question of time. He spoke of the possibility that the Cowper-Temple teaching might counteract the denominational teaching, that they might have in the room where Cowper-Temple teaching was being given some theological proposition or spirit inculcated which was not consistent with that going on in another room under the care, it might be, of an Anglican teacher. The same observation might be made, however, with regard to the Anglican teacher and the Cowper-Temple teacher. It might be possible that he would inculcate doctrines in one room highly inconsistent with those taught in another room under the right of entry; but it was not for the State to try to prevent the various religious denominations from trying to counteract each other. Undoubtedly they would seek to counteract each other; they must have the liberty to counteract each other, and the State certainly could not assume to prevent them. It would be a very undesirable course if they were to try in any way to limit the authority that any denomination might claim to possess in teaching doctrines inimical to others.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said that this was one of the matters which he raised at the opening of the debate yesterday, in reply to which the Prime Minister made on the whole a very considerate speech. He thought the learned Attorney-General misconceived the point made by his hon. friend It was perfectly true that if they admitted denominational teachers of different denominations into the same school, those teachers in their denominational classes would give teaching which in the different classes was inconsistent, but that was an entirely different thing from what his hon. friend said. It was the possibility that the school teacher giving the ordinary Cowper-Temple teaching might give something which was not what the learned Attorney-General described as the Cowper-Temple teaching, as having the fundamental basis of all Christian, or at any rate of all Protestant, teaching, but something which was inconsistent with the denominational super-struction which it was the object of this clause to allow the denominations to build up.

Mr. WALTERS (Sheffield, Brightside): Why not?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Could the hon. Gentleman really inquire why not? He did not know whether the hon. Member was a supporter of the Bill and desired to see a compromise effected. But his observation struck at the root of all compromise. Could the hon. Gentleman defend the proposition that for three days in the week the child should be subject to teaching subversive of the doctrines in which the parent believed, and then on two days a teacher should come in to counteract that subversive teaching? Surely that was not the doctrine of the Liberal Party?

Mr. WALTERS asked to be allowed to explain the object of his interjection. Suppose for example the Cowper-Temple teacher in his teaching took exception to the Anglican or Roman Catholic view on the Apostolic succession, would that not be Cowper-Temple teaching and yet destructive of a peculiar doctrine of the Anglican Church? Would the right hon. Gentleman say that teaching under the Cowper-Temple syllabus could be given without coming into collision with the doctrines of certain sections of the Anglican Church?.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he certainly took direct issue with the hon. Member. He was not a denominationalist, as the Committee knew by this time. He took direct issue as to what was permissible under the Cowper-Temple clause. If he was wrong and the hon. Member was right, then the Cowper-Temple clause was not the protection to anyone which the Government held it out and the country believed it to be; and it would be impossible to proceed with a Bill based on the Cowper-Temple clause. The Cowper-Temple clause, according to the Attorney-General, provided for the teaching of religious truths not specifically characteristic of any particular Church, but did not provide for teaching in an agressive form against the doctrine of any particular Church.

Sir W. ROBSON: Antagonistic teaching on the part of the Cowper-Temple teacher against some particular doctrine of a denomination would be clearly contrary to the spirit of the compromise.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that unless that was understood and clearly embodied in the law, compromise became impossible. He deplored the intolerant spirit shown by the hon. Member for Brightside in his explanation.

Mr. WALTERS said he was entitled to protest against language of that kind. He asked to be allowed to substitute another illustration. Suppose, in giving Cowper-Temple teaching common to all sections of the Christian faith, some doctrine should be inculcated that was antagonistic to the Unitarian faith; would that be considered as narrow-minded, intolerant, fanatical, and destructive of compromise?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he felt certain that if a teacher in a school in which there were children belonging to various denominations, in giving simple Bible-teaching such as was contemplated by the Cowper-Temple clause, took advantages of his opportunity and the trust confided in him to undermine the child's belief in his parents' religion, it would be an act of the grossest intolerance and a grave breach of trust. He was astonished to hear the hon. Member defend or recommend any such action, and was glad to think that teachers had a better sense of the responsibility of their position. The point which his hon. friend had submitted to the Attorney-General had reference to a fear that that might happen which apparently the hon. Member for Brightside would be prepared to defend. He did not himself believe that it would be largely done; but after the interruption from the hon. Gentleman, did not the Attorney-General see that the fear which existed was not altogether unreasonable? In the great bulk of the denominational schools at the present time, no more time was occupied in this instruction than the Government allowed in the Bill, but probably there would be some schools where further facilities would be desired, and what possible offence could it give to any sensitive Nonconformist to allow such facilities? It might be thought that the concession asked for would not really be of any use, but in making a bargain, was it not wise to give up that which involved no sacrifice on their own part?

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said it was not the case that in the past in the board schools the teachers had in connection with Cowper-Temple teaching insisted on those points on which Christians had divergent views. In his experience they had dwelt almost exclusively on those points on which all denominations concurred. He had sought and sought in vain for any cases of intolerance in the teaching under the Cowper-Temple clause. He knew that many such charges had been made, but they had never been substantiated. It was not his business to defend the Bill, or to support the Government in this controversy; but still he must say that there was no need for the apprehension shown on the one side or the other; because, he believed, whether the teaching was that of theological religion or that of the common denominator of Christian faith, the teachers would discharge their duty with honesty, fairness, and discretion. While it might be possible to arrange for the right of entry on two days of the week, if they extended it to three, four, or five days a week, it would be disastrous from an administrative point of view, and would interfere seriously with the work of the school. He was sure that if the Amendment were adopted it would defeat in practice the very aim which the hon. Member had theoretically in view. It might be possible, and he thought it would be possible, to arrange for this teaching two days a week without interfering with the administration of the school, but if hon. Gentlemen wanted to have three or four days a week they would go far to wreck the work of the institution, and if they desired that on four or five days a week certain children should be taught religion it would break down. [Cries of "Why?"] If he knew anything about the working of a school he said that would be the case. [Cries of "We want to know why."] Hon. Members would excuse him from explaining at great length to the Committee the many reasons why the arrangement would not work, and if they did not accept his view he could not help it.

MR. MILDMAY said he did not question the hon. Gentleman's right to speak with authority on this matter, but he was only anxious for information. He confessed he knew less than the hon. Member about these things.

*MR. YOXALL said the localities would have to arrange for the use of a certain room or rooms, and for the services of certain teachers. It might be possible, without infringing upon the general convenience or work of the school, to set a room or two rooms apart for one day or two days a week, but it would become increasingly difficult with each additional day, and it would become impossible for three, four, or five days a week. For a similar reason it might be possible to arrange for the service of a special teacher on two days a week, but it would be much more difficult to arrange for the curate or lay teacher to come into the school on four or five days a week.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): He can go in now under the Bill.

*MR. YOXALL said the teaching could be given by an outside teacher. The two days might not interfere with the efficiency of the school, but if it was three, four, or five days it would very seriously interfere with the work, and the whole system would break down. He would like, in the name of the general efficiency of the schools and the system of education in this country, to protest against any extension of what was now offered. Then they were going to provide for religious teaching of a specified kind for three-quarters of an hour. He put it to any man whether he did not think that a three-quarters of an hour sermon once a week was too long, and certainly twice a week was too long, unless the preacher was very able and entrancing. He put it to those who regarded this matter from the point of view of humanity and the religious interests of the children, and not on theological grounds, whether three-quarters of an hour was not too long on even one day a week for a religious lesson. In not a single council school at this moment was there a three-quarters of an hour lesson of this kind, and this Bill would completely destroy the present system, because it would give the parent the right to claim the actual teaching of dogmatic subjects for three-quarters of an hour on two days in each week. He protested against three-quarters of an hour for any lesson whatever. It was bad educationally, and there was no reason whatever for it. Three-quarters of an hour lesson for children of tender age was much too long. There was not an expert who would not tell them that three-quarters of an hour was too much on one subject at a time. A good deal of the effect of the teaching would be disastrous, and would certainly be not beneficial to the religious life of the children. He hoped the Government would make it clear that the three-quarters of an hour should contain at least the same ten minutes which was now occupied in religious observances in the morning, and if they would not do that, and the Bill passed in its present form, three-quarters of an hour was too much on two mornings, and to make it three, four, or five mornings in the week would be perfectly absurd. He protested against this application to the children of the poor and the working classes of rules and regulations and principles of lessons which were never used in the schools of the upper classes. Who were the men who were supporting this proposal? What was the length of their theological lessons at Eton and Harrow? How much of their time per day did they spend in school and college chapels? [An Hon. Member: More than that.] He knew better. They escaped from it whenever they could, and yet these were the men who came there and demanded that by law they should impose on children in the people's schools a length of theological teaching which they never experienced, and from which they escaped on every possible occasion. The parents of the children and the children had never grumbled at the present system, but, on the contrary, had expressed the greatest satisfaction with it, and he protested against this proposal in every possible way.

Lord EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) said that this question of two mornings a week was one of very great importance to the enormous number of Church of England schools in the division which he had the honour to represent in this House, but it was also a question of importance to the Catholics of the country, though, comparatively speaking, a very minor matter indeed. But it often happened in places where a new trade was started, or a new mine was opened, or there was the development of a new seaside resort that some of his co-religionists went there to start businesses, and for some time they were unable to provide themselves with schools, and in these places, of course, they would want to take full advantage of these two mornings a week. He wanted to have it clearly understood, and therefore he put a definite question to the hon. and learned Attorney-General, whether it was not a fact that it would be possible for the priest and the parson to get into a council school every day in the week? He understood that was so.

Sir W. ROBSON said that, as he understood, the noble Lord was showing that the religious instruction might be on any morning of the week. That was so, provided that no child got more than two mornings a week. The limit of two mornings a week was for the child and not for the school. Each child was to get two mornings a week, and if he did the law was satisfied.

Lord EDMUND TALBOT inquired whether it would be possible for the priest and the parson to get into the Council schools every day in the week, provided they did not teach the same child more than twice in the same week. If that was so, surely it could not do much harm if they let them teach the same child a little oftener.

*Mr. MASSIE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said the spirit in which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Worcestershire had approached them on this occasion, and the spirit in which he had approached the question on other occasions, made them most anxious to give him what he desired. But he ventured to submit that he did not fully appreciate the state of things which this compromise was already creating. That might be described as a state of irritation in many neighbourhoods, an irritation, not on the part of Nonconformists only, but on the part of many citizens who belonged to no Church whatever, because the schools, of whose freedom from clerical interference they had been proud, were now likely to be handed over for a certain time in the course of the week to that clerical interference; and even if this was only in private rooms, they strongly objected to it. It was very natural, therefore, that many Members of the House should desire to make that irritation as slight as possible. The fact that two days were being offered in the Bill was, as he had said, already creating friction. That offer had been made at a great cost to many of them, because even with two days only they were giving away the highly valued freedom of the schools from the atmosphere of religious differences. They did not desire, and he was quite sure that a vast number of people in the country connected with the council schools did not desire, the intrusion into these schools of denominational teaching. It interfered with the unity of the schools. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire had not in the slightest degree exaggerated the honourableness with which the teachers in the council schools had carried out the spirit of Cowper-Templeism. If Cowper-Templeism had done nothing else, it had created in these schools a public opinion, on the part of the teachers, in favour of due respect for the religious convictions of the parents whose children they were teaching. Two days a week was the price that they were preparing to pay, and a high price too, for peace outside the schools. Five days a week would immeasurably increase the price. The price was already high, and they could not pay more.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said the last speaker talked about the spirit of conciliation and compromise. He thought if hon. Members wished to preserve that spirit they would have to muzzle the hon. Member for Nottingham, because if he made many more speeches in the same vein as he had adopted that evening—a vein which he should not endeavour to copy—the spirit of compromise would disappear.

Mr. YOXALL: I voted against the Bill.

Mr. LANE-FOX said he was perfectly aware of that, but whether he supported or opposed the Bill, he had no right to deal with the matter in the spirit in which he thought he had dealt with it. The hon. Member told the Committee that the system suggested by the Amendment was impossible, but beyond that he gave very few and insufficient reasons for it. But the noble Lord had pointed out—and this was proved beyond all doubt—that this teaching could be given, and was given, every day. The whole mistake which underlay this question was pointed out by the hon. Member for the Brightside Division of Sheffield. Cowper-Temple teaching was not a definite teaching of any kind; it was merely a negative form of teaching.

Mr. WALTERS: I must ask the hon. Member not to put into my mouth so absurd a proposition as that.

Mr. LANE-FOX did not suggest the hon. Member said that. That was his own statement. Cowper-Temple instruction merely embodied a negative form of teaching, and, therefore, they were bound to get an opportunity for all sorts of teaching under the Cowper-Temple

Clause. He believed that if a man wished he could teach Ritualism or give mere Bible-reading under that clause, so long as he did not embody it in a dogmatic form. That was the objection of Members of the Opposition. That was the reason they said that there was no guarantee that there would not be a conflict between the teaching given on one day under the Cowper-Temple Clause, and the teaching given on another day in a denominational form. It was impossible for the Government to lay down the principle that nothing taught under the Cowper-Temple Clause would conflict with the teaching given in a denominational form on another day. Hon. Members had no right to assume that the teaching required by those who supported the Amendment was purely the catechism. Everybody must recognise that what they wanted was not to impress dogma on children every morning, but to give teaching with a guarantee that behind it would be found that well-founded and genuine belief which was not to be found under the Cowper-Temple clause.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said that the special teaching on two days a week was regarded as one of the distinctive features of the compromise which they understood was arrived at, and he thought he had some right to submit that to the consideration of the House, because the last time the matter was discussed in the House two years ago, he moved an Amendment for doing away with the two days and allowing special instruction to be given on every day of the week. It was argued then that probably it would make no difference in the long run, and that two days a week would be ultimately all that would be required, and, therefore, by conceding five days they were doing no more than if they conceded only two days, because the remaining three would not be used. He submitted that in this case it concerned not the transferred schools, but it mainly affected the great board schools of the [illegible]. He thought the President of the Board of Education was justified in concluding that the main body of board school educationists would regard the giving up of restrictions regarding the five days as a far greater concession than giving up two only. Therefore, he appealed to those Members who desired to support the Bill to consider this as a question already decided, and to occupy the limited time of the Committee with those matters which were more open to criticism, and possibly to amendment.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said the speech of the hon. Member for Brightside had convinced him that it was necessary that he should support the Amendment. He had always felt the Cowper-Temple teaching had admitted the expression of dogmatic theological opinion, but they had always been assured—and he believed it was generally though not universally the case—that Cowper-Temple teaching consisted of those fundamental Christian truths, common certainly to all the Protestant creeds and common, he believed, to the Roman Catholic Church, though they could not accept that particular form of presentation, and that therefore it might very properly be a foundation on which the two days' denominational teaching might be given. But, if it was suggested, as it was by an hon. Member who had had considerable experience in educational matters, that Cowper-Temple teaching might properly be used to counteract and undermine the denominational teaching which was given to the child on two days of the week, then it appeared to him that the parent should be safeguarded by the permission to insist that his child should receive the denominational teaching on all the five days of the week on which religious instruction was given. In that way only could he be guarded against conflicting religious opinion, contradictory to the tenets of the parent, and profoundly repugnant to his wishes. If there was any risk that this teaching might be given in a controversial spirit and in a way contrary to the wishes of many of the parents, was it not desirable that this teaching should be given under some form of supervision and inspection that should ensure to the parents that their children were not taught on three days a week doctrines that were subversive of what they were taught on the other two days?

*MR. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham) thought that this Amendment was contrary to the scheme of the Bill and to the spirit of compromise behind it.

The stipulation that there should be in all schools compulsory Cowper-Temple teaching was not a stipulation made by the Nonconformists. It came from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who insisted on Cowper-Temple teaching being given by the local education authority to the whole of the children of the country, subject, of course, to the conscience clause. The stipulation was that there should be Cowper-Temple teaching on three days of the week, and specific Church teaching on the other two days. That meant that Cowper-Temple teaching was not inconsistent with Church teaching, and nine-tenths of the people of the country believed the Cowper-Temple teaching did include the fundamental principles of Christianity. If that were so, would it be contended that more than two days a week was at all necessary for inculcating those particular doctrines of the Church of England which were not inculcated in Cowper-Temple teaching? He thought the proposition was almost absurd. When they thought of little children, how much could they teach them of special doctrines wherein the Church of England differed from the bulk of Nonconformists? Up to the age of ten he thought they ought to be content with teaching the child those fundamental doctrines which practically included his own parent's specific religious faith. The compromise embodied in the Bill contained those great principles which he believed were firmly held by the great majority of the people of this country. In the first place, there was a common root of Christianity which they might safely teach to all children; and the second principle, held by most Christians in this country, *i.e.*, that it was impossible that they should train up the population as Christians to do the best Christian work of which they were capable unless they taught the youth of the country, before they attained the age of thirteen of fourteen, that their duty was to belong to one of the great Christian communities. He believed that religious education would be incomplete unless it taught children when they came to be of full age that they should belong to one of the great Christian bodies in this country. and he believed that they would be infinitely better Christians, more forcible in fighting against the evil things of this world, if they began by teaching them that there was one great common Christian brotherhood of which the denominations were merely regiments in a fighting army.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) said he admired the sentiment expressed by the last speaker, that they should train children to the recognition of the great Christian brotherhood, but he confessed when he heard from the speeches how much they were afraid that the balance of advantage might be turned to the Church side or to the side of the Nonconformist, that the spirit of brotherhood was hardly contemplated in a practical way in Parliament. He wished to point out to the Government what in his opinion were the dangers which beset them along the line on which they were going. He found that those whom he regarded as well qualified to speak for the Church of England, as the Archbishop of Canterbury claimed to do, would not be satisfied with the provisions of this clause. Two days a week would not satisfy them for all time, and undoubtedly at succeeding elections, and in Parliament, demands would be made for the amendment of this Bill, so as to allow of tests and the right of entry into provided schools without any restriction whatever. He believed with the hon. Member for Nottingham that they should restrict this right as far as possible. In his view, two mornings a week, or three-quarters of an hour's definite dogmatic teaching, was quite as much as an ordinary child could assimilate. He agreed that they should seek not to extend the opportunities for this right of entry, but to hedge them round with reasonable restrictions as far as possible. He conceived that this was going to be a real danger to our educational system. After all, in the provided schools they had largely imbued the children with a recognition of the spirit of social unity. In his view, the right of entry would dissipate that altogether. The children in future would be divided into little sects, and undoubtedly that spirit of social unity would suffer proportionately. Further, he was inclined to think that the discipline of the school must be affected. He tried to picture to himself what would follow if this Bill became an Act of Parliament. Each morning the children would gather together, and would be divided into different sects. This meant that the school discipline would be upset completely every morning in the week. The head teacher was to look on passively and not interfere at all with what was being done by those who came in from outside. Moreover, different views might be held by the different teachers who imparted religious instruction. And the question was asked whether there was to be any supervision. For his own part he failed to see how supervision could be exercised, because it would need an army of inspectors, nearly one inspector to every teacher. He was convinced that the parents were not requiring that there should be the right of entry into council schools. It might be that the compromise had been entered into by persons who had no responsibility whatever, because they were repudiated in that House, but even if the terms of compromise did bring about peace inside the House of Commons, he was certain that it was going to create chaos and disorder in every one of the public schools. He believed that the parents did not desire it. But he could quite see that the different sects would immediately set to work. The parents' belief would be inquired into, and there would be some sort of religious inquisition instituted in the land. The parents would be marked off—as some of them were now politically—according to their religious opinions. He entered a strong protest against this right of entry at all, but certainly if they were unable to prevent its being enacted. he sincerely trusted that the Government would not give any further extension to the principle

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) thought there was a fallacy underlying the arguments of hon. Members on the other side, namely, that Cowper-Templeism as a foundation and a top-dressing of Church of England teaching would satisfy the vast majority of Church people as the religious education which ought to be given to their children. That, he thought, was also the underlying consideration which had induced the Government to refuse this very reasonable Amendment. He would ask hon. Members opposite to endeavour to meet the Church a little more than they were trying to do. It might seem unreasonable that all Church people did not accept Cowper-Temple teaching as a complete substratum, but in a great many places of Lancashire and elsewhere they desired their own teachers to teach Church principles in their own way. That might appear unreasonable, but why would they not allow them to have it? So far as the provided schools were concerned, he could understand perfectly well the position of hon. Members opposite. But he asked them to consider for a moment the position of the Church of England, in those schools which were in single-school areas. They had schools built with the subscriptions of poor men for the express purpose that their children should have a Church of England atmosphere and Church of England teaching on five days a week. What were they going to do under this Bill in single school areas? They were taking away these schools from the Church of England, and they were going to say to the majority of the parents—because they must be the majority for they had built the schools—that they were only to be allowed, at their own expense, two mornings a week when their children might be taught their religious faith, while the minority of parents who were satisfied with Cowper-Temple teaching were to have five mornings a week with nothing to pay. Then take the Roman Catholic schools, of which there were some twenty-five in England in single school-areas. Consider the position of the children in these Catholic schools in those single-school areas. No one would say that simple Cowper-Temple teaching would satisfy Catholic parents, and yet if they were not given an entry on five days a week, but only on two, they were saying to those Catholics who had built the schools: "Your children are going to have no religious instruction at all, or they are going to have Cowper-Temple teaching on three days a week, and only on two days a week are the priest and the nun to be allowed to come in and teach them." That was a very great injustice. If the Government could see their way to make a compromise, to restrict the right of entry to two days a week in the old provided schools, and extend it to five in the Church and Catholic schools, they would do no harm to their own cause, and would certainly remove the very sore and angry feeling in Lancashire at the way in which the Catholic and Church schools were being filched from them.

*MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton): expressed regret that the development of the debate had not seemed to bring about a greater identity of opinion, but he hoped hon. Members opposite, who attached great importance to the right of entry, would consider that some of them who were perfectly loyal to this part of the Bill, much as they disliked it, saw very grave practical objections to the alteration proposed by the hon. Member for Totnes. He did not think anyone had denied that as, a matter of actual fact, throughout the country denominational teaching was only given at the most on two days in the week, and very often only on one, in Church schools. When they found in a syllabus issued by a Diocesan Education Society that provision was made for this kind of instruction on only one morning in the week, and never on more than two, it was clear that the Bill as it stood was honestly trying to carry out what already existed by the wish and authority of the Church leaders in their own schools. Accordingly the onus of proof was very heavy on the hon. Member and his friends if they sought under this Bill to get more than was their unfettered practice at present in their own schools. That was admitted by the hon. Member for Oxford University, who had accused some members on that side of frivolity, because their conscience was affected by the difference between two and three days. It was not a question of conscience, but of practicability and fairness. He thought the hon. Gentleman himself had indulged in quite unwonted levity in a matter of this importance, when he knew that the ordinary practice was in accord with what the Government proposed, and yet said he would vote for the Amendment because of a casual remark of an hon. Member, who had been elaborately though unintentionally misinterpreted. That was deciding the question on a very minute detail. Any teacher known to be so teaching religion under the Cowper-Temple clause as to be really launching polemics against denominational instruction, would have very short shrift from any local education authority in the country. The real guarantee for what they all desired, that Cowper-Temple teaching should be used in no aggressive spirit, did not consist in the method proposed by the hon. Gentleman of eating into the Cowper-Temple teaching by this enlarged facility, but in a sense of fairness which local education authorities would have, and also in the great disinclination of local education authorities to have more religious controversy and discord than they could possibly avoid. There was no real danger to be run in that particular. Hon. Gentlemen put it with great seriousness that if they allowed the clergy or other persons to teach denominational instruction twice a week, and that could only be done by allowing them to come in every day, there was no difference in actual practical administration. There was an enormous difference if they were allowed to teach the same children every day. If there were thirty children desiring denominational instruction, there would have to be sixty lessons in the course of the week. If the Amendment were carried and denominational instruction was given five times a week, they would have to provide 150 lessons, which was a far greater disturbance of the ordinary methods of the school than where they were merely providing sixty. He was sure the ordinary administrator, who looked at this, not as a Churchman or a Dissenter, but as one who had to see that education was smoothly carried on, would see the enormous difference between two days a week and the three, four, or five days a week which would be possible under the Amendment. He was not opposing the Amendment with any wish to make these facilities anything but a reality, but while, on the one hand, one was anxious that these facilities should be adequate and real, he was also anxious that they should not be so arranged as to lead to the disorganisation of the schools.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) thought the Amendment reasonable and just, but said the debate would bring home to many men the extent of the concession which had been made. When they once allowed the right of entry they would be dragged in spite of themselves to allow it on equal terms to all denominations. That seemed to be the weak point in the position of those who supported the compromise, and what made it almost impossible, although it did not press upon the Catholics, was that they were for the first time establishing in the common schools of England an endowed, established, and compulsory form of religious instruction. It was no use trying to get away from it. He had only to quote the words of the Rev. Scott Lidgett, which would be heard again and again—

> "Throughout the country in the course of this controversy let us always remember that in spite of this compromise Cowper-Templeism remains the established religion of the schools of England."

He believed that was an impossible position to maintain. He did not believe it would work out as a compromise to invite the Church of England to come into these schools in an inferior position only on two days a week. The question, what was Cowper-Templeism, and what could be done under it, had always had an extraordinary attraction for him, and he had never heard anyone really adequately explain the matter. It would, of course, be possible under it to carry on propaganda against the doctrines of the Church of England or Rome, and it was idle and absurd to repeat the cant phrase about Cowper-Templeism being simple Christianity free from dogma. Did simple Bible teaching include the New Testament and the sayings of Christ, and were they going to teach children the New Testament and not tell them who the chief figure of the New Testament was? If they did tell them who He was, was not that dogma, and would it not bring them into collision with Unitarians? He could never see his way through this maze of Cowper-Temple teaching at all. They could not teach the Bible or the New Testament without plunging into theology. They could teach no religion without theology or without dogma. In his opinion, under the Cowper-Temple clause, they could teach the Catholic religion. It depended on who drew up the syllabus. Catholics could draw up a syllabus without infringing the clause. Was it not rather childish to imagine that if they banished the Catechism they banished dogma out of the schools? There was nothing magical in the Catechism. They could teach under the Cowper-Temple system whatever the local authority chose to put into the syllabus, and the local authority, if they desired to counteract the influence of the High Church parson, could, and probably would, carry on something in the nature of a propaganda against his doctrine. They could not have the two things, and there was no use in attempting to get them; they could not have the schools free from the contentions of different religious denominations and at the same time allow the denominations into the schools. They were met the other day by a reference to schools in America and Australia, and warned that their fate might be similar to theirs. He had been in those schools in America and Australia, and there they had no conflict with the sects because they had a secular system. Once they established religious teaching in the schools they would open the flood-gates to all the dangers he had mentioned. He had dealt with the two points which induced him to intervene. It seemed to him that the Nonconformists had been led on to make a far greater sacrifice in this compromise than if they had accepted Clause 4 of the Act of 1906. That would have left the board schools intact under a system they approved of, but now they had invited the Church into their schools, and they would insist upon being put upon an equality with Cowper-Templeism. He supported this Amendment because he thought it was fair, and because hon. Members above the gangway supported the Catholics on a critical Amendment. This Amendment did nothing for Catholics, because their ideals ran in a totally different direction. They wanted a school where the whole atmosphere was Catholic. The noble Lord had so eloquently expressed their view on this matter that he was almost tempted to invite him to come over and join them. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!"] He did not mean anything offensive, but the noble Lord had eloquently expressed their view of this subject when he said that he attached supreme importance to impressing upon the mind of the children the fact that they belonged to a great ecclesiastical organisation, and that was the only way in which religion could be kept alive. The children should be taught that they were members of a great Church entrusted with the task of maintaining the Christian faith. Catholics had no interest in the right of entry, and he looked forward to the day when Nonconformists would deeply regret they did not meet them on this question in 1906.

Mr. WALTERS said that poor, simple Nonconformists, who were persuaded to accept this compromise, imagined that as far as the council schools were concerned they would preserve their old freedom from religious interference, and that all they were asked to do was to give the opportunity on two mornings a week for denominational instruction to be given to the children of the parents who desired it above and beyond the ordinary Cowper-Temple instruction they were receiving on the other days in the week. They understood that all the children would assemble at the morning worship. They imagined that under the compromise it would still be possible for the children to look upon each other in a friendly way without being divided into sectarian pens, and that there would still be some common ground upon which the children would share the same kind of religious exercise. But nothing of that sort was to be continued. The children of denominationalists were not to be contaminated by singing hymns with Cowper-Temple children. They were to have on two mornings a week not Cowper-Temple instruction but some other kind of foundation on which the superstructure of the Anglican Church religion might be built. That was not what Nonconformists or the supporters of council schools expected. He had had practical experience of council schools for a great many years, and to grant the right of entry on two mornings a week with the inevitable division of the teachers into different sects, was an enormous sacrifice to make. A full denominational atmosphere for certain children in the schools was not the basis of a compromise to which Nonconformists could agree. It was not a compromise when one party swallowed the other. When the whale appropriated Jonah it was not a compromise—far from it. He was prepared for a reasonable compromise, but if Members opposite imagined this was to be the beginning of a kind of absorption of the whole educational system by denominations they did not understand the spirit and thought of the country. He had nothing to say to priests and parsons in their proper place, but he did not want them in the schools. He objected to them from every standpoint. They gave no help educationally or religiously. They stirred up strife and contention and nothing but mischief resulted. Hon. Members opposite argued that if they were going to give denominational teaching on two mornings a week it was quite simple to give it on five mornings. Supposing they had a school with only two classrooms, holding thirty scholars each, and they wanted two classrooms to accommodate the number of children who wanted special instruction on two mornings. If they increased the number to five times a week they would not have sufficient accommodation, and they could not be expected to expand their schools at the dictation of the denominations. In a large number of schools the classroom accommodation was a very serious difficulty. If they were going to give this special grant of denominational instruction on five mornings they would require a larger staff of teachers, and that practically meant compelling a large proportion of the teachers in the school to volunteer for special religious instruction. The whole object of this proposal was to create a denominational atmosphere and impose denominational instruction upon council schools. He was prepared to sacrifice a great many of his prejudices and a few of his principles for this compromise, but nothing would induce him to vote for a claim of this kind if it was to be extended in every direction. First they made a small concession, and then they were asked to give five times as much. As far as he was concerned, if the Government went on making concessions he should not support them. He had been lectured by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for saying that Cowper-Temple teaching could be given which was antagonistic to the doctrines of the Anglican Church, but this was perfectly true. Simple Bible instruction taught that salvation was through Jesus Christ, but many Anglicans held that salvation was through Apostolic succession and all the machinery of a State church. He hoped the Government would resist the Amendment and not allow itself to become the Jonah and the other side the whale.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN did not think the remarks of the last speaker had contributed towards a peaceful solution of this difficult question. The hon. Member, speaking as the chairman of an education committee, said that the Cowper-Temple clause was antagonistic and destructive of the beliefs of the children of the Church of England.

MR. WALTERS said the right hon. Gentleman was not quoting him correctly. He did not say so.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN believed he was correctly interpreting what the hon. Gentleman said. When the hon. Gentleman interrupted him it was to ask—why should not teachers who gave Cowper-Temple teaching give instruction which was destructive of the Christian faith? Such a question went far to justify the fear which he did not share but which was felt by many of his hon. friends, and if there was no other argument in favour of the Amendment now before the Committee the statement which the hon. Member had made as to the practice in schools with which he was acquainted was sufficient to justify them in pressing for the adoption of the Amendment.

MR. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said the question they were discussing was one of fact. His desire was that the right of entry should be a genuine concession and not an illusory one. The question of fact was: On how many days was it usual for special religious instruction to be given? When they had decided that question they would be able to say on how many days it should be made statutory by this Bill. Light had been thrown on that subject by the utterances of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He reminded the Committee that the First Lord of the Admiralty brought forward last year a statement which purported to show the proportion of the time worked by teachers which represented that occupied in giving special religious instruction. The statement called forth protests from some hon. Gentlemen who stated that the fraction was a great deal too big. The hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division of Sheffield stated—

"The general practice in the Church of England schools at the present time was that special religious teaching was only for one half-hour in the week."

Various controversialists outside said that one-fifteenth was a ridiculous fraction to take. Canon Alford said—

"In most Church schools they found that the two Scripture knowledge lessons in the week were the only ones that could be called denominational, and the other three were as purely Scripture lessons as in any Council school. In some Church schools the time given to denominational teaching was even less."

Canon Cleworth said—

"Moreover, the teaching of the Catechism and Prayer Book occupy only one-thirtieth of the weekly school hours, so that instead of one-fifteenth, one-nintieth is a more accurate estimate."

Judging of the question in the light of those statements it seemed to him that two mornings a week were quite sufficient. He understood that there were three definite propositions. One was that denominational teaching should be given on only two days in the week in any given school; the second was that any child should have denominational teaching on only two days of the week; and the third was that any child should have denominational teaching every day of the week if necessary. That was what he understood the Amendment to mean. The Bill brought in by the Chief Secretary for Ireland was before the House laid down that denominational instruction in the transferred schools should be given only on two days of the week, and an Amendment was put down by an hon. Member on the other side of the House to make it clear that every child should be entitled to receive special religious instruction on two days of the week, although the teaching itself might have to take place on four days of the week. The Chief Secretary at that time admitted that the intention of the Government was that no child should be entitled to have the special religious instruction on more than two days a week.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.), as one who voted for the Second Reading of the Bill, could not support the Amendment, because it was against the spirit of the compromise entered into. The position the Archbishop of Canterbury accepted in principle was that Cowper-Temple teaching was sufficient for Christian children. There were hon. Members who did not accept that view; for instance, the hon. Member for East Mayo declared that Cowper-Temple teaching was worse than nothing; but representatives of the Church of England did not take up that attitude. The compromise was founded on the idea that Cowper-Temple teaching on three mornings and denominational teaching on two mornings was sufficient Christian education for a child up to the age of fourteen. It was his view, after following the discussions upon earlier Education Bills, that it would not be impossible for all denominations to come together and settle upon some form of religious teaching sufficient for young children. Cowper-Temple teaching, if given honestly, as it had been and would be, by a teacher worthy of his position, was sufficient. A teacher must have the confidence of the children he taught; he must not deceive them. If he attempted that he would soon be found out, and it was easy to lose the confidence of children. If he gave instruction with —so to speak—his tongue in his cheek, he would lose the children's confidence and the whole tone of the school would deteriorate. There was no danger if the teaching were given in an honest manner. It was based on the Bible, and, after all, there must be some common form of belief in Christianity in these days, 2,000 years after Christ. He was reading not long since from a book written some 250 years ago by a celebrated divine, Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury, in which it was declared that the fundamental faith of Christianity was that Jesus was the Christ, and surely that was taught under the Cowper-Temple clause?

LORD R. CECIL: It may not be.

MR. LAMBTON: Surely his noble friend would not say that it did not teach Christianity? If it did not, they had better give up the Bill at once and have secular teaching. His noble friend must have some faith in the Christianity of his fellows. As the same old writer to whom he referred said, if assent were required to all the doctrines taught by theologians nothing in the world would be so hard as to be a Christian. Why put difficulties in the way of children? What would a child of fourteen understand of this discussion? Suppose the empty Gallery of the House were filled with listening children, what would they understand of this discussion? They would hear Members apparently abusing each other and telling each other across the floor of the House that they were not true Christians, and what would the children think of that? He believed the compromise was an honest compromise, and he could not support the Amendment.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (MR. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) said he was quite sure the Committee would appreciate the speech just delivered as a sensible contribution to the debate. Everybody admitted that the old Cowper-Temple clause was a vague clause, and that no clause could accurately define the kind of education given for the last thirty-eight years. It could not be defined, but they could act on the experience of it. All the school authorities had acted with due regard for the sacredness of the teaching given under the clause, and when the noble Lord insisted that religious teaching to be efficient must be denominational he asked, Was this not so abroad? He remined the noble Lord of the China mission and the report of the undenominational character of the organisation and teaching of that mission to which Lord William Cecil attached his signature. All that was now asked was that there should not be artifically created differences of Christian teaching, just as they were not to be created in China. Of course, they might continue to bandy *tu quoques* over the Cowper-Temple clause, but sensible men would be content to lean on the experience they had had. The hon. Member for Brightside said he had known teaching given antagonistic to

Church doctrines, but he could only say, after seeing a good deal of school administration, that he had never heard of anything of the kind. That, he believed, had been the general experience of administrators. As a matter of fact, the Amendment before the Committee was founded on the proposition that the Cowper-Temple clause was not sufficient for Church school-children and that they required Church teaching on the five days of the week when two had been sufficient in the past. They had done their best to meet hon. Gentlemen opposite. The Government had gone a long way to meet them. They had done their best to be generous in granting fair facilities for religious instruction. They had done what they could to make the concessions which they had granted real concessions. They had done what they could to make them good, not only in the mere machinery, but in giving the children the religious instruction which their parents desired. The demand which was put forward that special denominational instruction should be given five days a week went beyond anything that had been asked for before. Even if that were granted, he did not believe that it would be taken advantage of, except by people who wished to upset Cowper-Temple teaching, and if the Government were to suggest such a thing he did not think they could carry it in this House, and certainly they would not have with them the main body of the people outside.

Lord R. CECIL said he would not detain the Committee more than a few minutes. He wished first of all respectfully to recognise, if he might, the admirable tone which had characterised the speeches of the Minister for Education. He rose mainly to reply in a word or two to the speech of the hon. Member for South-East Durham. The Minister for Education quoted a statement of what was done at some meeting in China, with reference to a concordat which had been entered into by the missionaries. With every word of that declaration he was in hearty and complete agreement. He did not himself doubt that there was an essential agreement between all the sects who held the Christian faith, including the Roman Catholics, with regard to the fundamental doctrines of that faith. And he fully agreed with the hon. Member for South-East Durham that the points on which all the sects were at one were out of all proportion to those on which they differed. He had never said anything in this House which would conflict with that opinion, and if anyone imagined that he had done so he would be delighted to withdraw it and do penance in a white sheet. But he wished to say that to attempt to teach, particularly to the young, Christianity on an undenominational basis was, in his judgment, wrong and doomed to failure. It was all very true to say that they were agreed as to the great doctrines of the Christian faith and that they should recognise what the different sects had done in the way of the conversion of the heathen; but he did not want anything to be done by the State to compel anyone to adopt the teaching of the Anglican or the Wesleyan or any other religious body. What he wanted was to give an opportunity to the parents to have their children taught the faith which they themselves held. If they tied the hands of all the sects and said that they were not to teach the children in such a way as to attach them to the denomination to which the parents belonged, then the State would be putting fetters on the hands of the teachers which would make it impossible for them to do the work which they were set to do. His hon. friend had said very truly that it was part of the spirit of Cowper-Templeism not only that they were not to seek to attach children to this or that particular religious body, but not to detach them from the religious denomination to which the parents belonged. Although he deplored the tone of the hon. Member for the Brightside division, he entirely agreed with the substance of his speech, and he could not see how anyone could disagree with it. It was that there was nothing in the Cowper-Temple clause to prevent teaching being given which was hostile to Christianity, and the hon. Gentleman had given an admirable instance of it. His hon. friend had said with great indignation that it was absurd to suppose that under the Cowper-Temple clause any teacher could teach what was against Christianity; but his hon. friend was up in the clouds in regard to this matter, for it had been proved over and over again that under Cowper-Templeism there was teaching which might be moral but was not Christianity. There was no doubt whatever that that had been done. For himself, he held that the case put forward by the hon. Member who moved the Amendment was irresistible, viz., that it was desirable, if the parents wished it, that they should have an opportunity of their children being taught their own religion not only two but five days in the week if they were satisfied that Cowper-Temple teaching was not in accordance with their religion but was hostile to it. He objected to this labelling of denominational teaching with the badge of inferiority. The proposal in the Bill was one more step towards the discouragement of denominational teaching, which he believed was the only really effective way of teaching Christianity. For that reason he would support the Amendment.

*MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said that he knew many schools in which Cowper-Temple teaching had been given for years, and in these schools there were children whose parents belonged to different denominations but who raised no objection whatever to that teaching. Some months ago he was in a school in Scotland where children belonging to every denomination, sitting on the same benches, were being given religious instruction by the same teacher who had been master of the school for twenty-eight years. He asked that teacher whether he had had any difficulty in regard to this religious teaching, and the teacher assured him that he had never during all those years had a single complaint made by any parent of a child attending the school, although the children belonged to every denomination in Scotland. He maintained that in the face of facts like these the Minister for Education had a right to appeal to experience that there was no difficulty in teaching the fundamental principles of Christianity to classes of mixed denominational children. The Cowper-Temple clause was in no sense a form of religious belief, but merely a prohibition against the use of certain dogmatic forms. No one could say that the Sermon on the Mount was either denominational or indefinite. It must then be conceded that there was such a thing as definite religious instruction which was not denominational but which had had a beneficial result on the character of the children, a result which remained with them all their lives.

MR. WALTER GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds) said that as he read the Amendment it would make the position of the Church of England not better but worse, because it would put it entirely within the power of the local education authority to say on which days religious instruction was to be given. He believed that this compromise had been entered into in a perfectly honest spirit, but if the hon. Gentleman's interpretation was right, very great confusion would be caused, because they had been told that the local education authorities would try to prevent the Bill being worked in the spirit of give and take, and that they might say that it would be inconvenient for them to give more than one day to special denominational religious instruction. Thus endless difficulties would be caused and an appeal to the Board of Education as to whether there should be religious instruction on two or five days would be useless. If they wanted to avoid trouble they should define the obligation of the local authority to give religious instruction, but as the clause now stood a loophole would be left to the local education authority to evade the obligation.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 269; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 426.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)

Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt HnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,CH.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh

Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats,Sir T.(Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guinness,W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gulland, John W
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kerry, Earl of
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Normann
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield,H. Rendall (Lincoln)

Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn.A.C.(Kincard-
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price,C.E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Rt.Hn.H.L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,Sir CharlesEdw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,Hn.A Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.

Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De. R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Master of Elibank and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlille, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Ginnell, L.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Halpin, J.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helmsley, Viscount
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Percy, Earl
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheehy, David
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'rd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Winterton, Earl
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Mildmay and Mr. Lane-Fox.

Sir BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg) asked whether his proposal to insert after the first word "on" the word "any" would not make the intention of the Government clearer than it seemed to be at present. He took it that two mornings of the week might only mean Monday and Tuesday, whereas if the word "any" were added it would make the matter plainer. He put the Amendment forward in order to see if the Government thought right to accept it, but he should not carry the matter to a division, because they had stated that every teacher of a denomination would have facilities to enter any school on any day of the week. He only wished to put in the word "any" to make it certain that the teachers would be able to enter the school on any day of the week if they did not teach an individual child more than twice. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the first word 'on,' to insert the word 'any.'"—*(Sir Berkeley Sheffield.)*

Question proposed, "That the word 'any' be there inserted."

Sir W. ROBSON was understood to say that he thought the insertion of this word would go a good deal further than the hon. Baronet himself intended according to the explanation he had given. It would give the parent the right to claim instruction on any morning without reference to the particular two selected by the local authority. In other words it would give the control of the arrangements for this kind of instruction to the parent instead of to the authority, and that would give rise to great inconvenience. It was for the authority to settle how many mornings they might think it convenient to give the instruction, and they might say three mornings or four mornings, and the hon. Baronet's Amendment would be an interference with their discretion which he did not think would facilitate the working of the clause.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) inquired whether the clause would not allow the authority to say that they did not intend the instruction to go on on Tuesday, and in defiance of the parent they might say that they would not allow denominational instruction on certain days.

Sir W. ROBSON said the authority could name the days, but it must arrange at least two mornings. If it could arrange for every such child getting two mornings by giving less than four or five days a week, they would do it. If one of the two days did clash with the convenience of the parent it would be a misfortune but he did not think they could meet it.

Mr. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) inquired whether the local authority would not be bound by subsection (6) which provided that they should have regard to the number of children or different groups of children for whom religious instruction provided by the authority and religious instruction under this section were from time to time respectively desired, to the proportion of the number of those children in each case to the total number of children in attendance at the school, to the number of persons available to give the different forms of teaching, and to the manner in which the class-rooms might be used most conveniently by those several teachers. They therefore could not make the instruction any particular mornings in the week provided there was a sufficient number of children desiring this form of instruction to make it necessary for them to appoint denominational teaching on every day.

Sir W. ROBSON said that subsection (6) made it perfectly clear. It said the authority were to take into account the circumstances, and secure for each child instruction on two mornings a week in their institution. In order to fulfil that obligation they must allow the teachers to come in every day if necessary, but if they could fulfil that obligation by allowing them to come in four days a week they would be at liberty to do so.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said that this was a matter of importance. As he understood the Attorney-General, if the local authority desired they could roughly estimate that denominational teaching would require only a certain number of teachers. They might say to the teachers they gave them two days a week on which they could have four different class-rooms of a respectable size, but there might not be four teachers on that particular morning. In that way the local authority might have full power to stop the denominational teaching from going on properly. His right hon. friend would notice that subsection (6) did not require the local education authority to take into account the number of teachers.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, yes; it says that the local education authority shall have regard "to the number of persons available."

MR. RAWLINSON: If that be so, I have nothing more to say.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. YOXALL, in moving to insert the word "appointed," said the object of his Amendment was to secure that two days only should be appointed for this purpose as a result of the endeavour of the local education authority to meet the wishes of the parents. He did not want class "A" to be taken on Mondays and Wednesdays and class "B" on Tuesdays and Thursdays. He wanted, if possible, to narrow these five days to any given children to two days of the week—to allow only two days a week. That was what he believed the Government wanted, and that was what he asked them to do. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

'In page 2, line 26, after the word 'two' to insert the word 'appointed.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'appointed' be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON assured the hon. Gentleman that the Government would be only too happy to accept any Amendment of his to safeguard this matter, but they thought that this Amendment would too greatly limit the authority. The local education authority would have a very difficult task in cases where a great many denominations put forward a claim for this right of entry. He thought this matter ought to be left entirely to the local education authority.

Amendment negatived.

LORD R. CECIL, on behalf of the hon. Member for Norwood moved to substitute the word "each" for the first word "the" so that the clause should read "for the purpose of enabling that child to receive that instruction on two mornings in each week on which the school meets." It had occurred to his hon. friend whether the section as drafted would carry out the intentions of the Government whether it would not confine this to two mornings in the week on which the school met.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out the first word 'the' and insert the word 'each.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'each' be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON did not think that could be so.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester) said the Amendment he desired to move was a small one, but he ventured to think not unimportant. Its object was that when parents demanded this privilege they should be assured that it would be given to them for twelve months.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 27, after the word 'meets,' to insert the words 'for twelve calendar months thereafter.'"—(*Mr. Essex.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON thought it would be most undesirable to put a limit on these arrangements.

Amendment negatived.

*MR. ASHLEY moved an Amendment the object of which, he said, was to make it obligatory on the local authorities to make suitable accommodation for denominational teaching either in or adjoining the schoolhouse. He saw no reason why the local education authority should not give equal facilities to denominational education as to undenominational. If the right of entry was to be real the local education authorities must, even at some expense, give the children, of those parents who desired to avail themselves of the right of entry, this accommodation, and that could only be done by providing room for these denominational classes. The local education authorities were compelled to give secular instruction to every child, and Cowper-Temple teaching to every child between 9 and 9.45 a.m., if the child's parent demanded it. If it was obligatory on the local education authority to give Cowper-Temple teaching then it was not fair that they should be able to say that the denominational teaching could not be given unless there was some accommodation available for the purpose. If that were allowed Cowper-Temple teaching would be given the preference. He could not see why in most cases, even if there was no room in the schoolhouse, the local education authority should not hire a room in the neighbourhood; otherwise denominational teaching would be placed in an inferior position to Cowper-Temple teaching. If this was to be a compromise, the Bill must not be allowed to leave the House with that sense of inferiority on the part of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. Whatever arrangements were made by high ecclesiastical authorities had been made without any consultation with those who sat on the Opposition benches, and they were not bound by what had been agreed to by the bishops and archbishops. Unless undenominationalism and denominationalism were placed on an equality there could not be a settlement. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 27, to leave out from the word 'meets,' to the end of the subsection, and insert the words 'provide suitable accommodation in or adjoining the schoolhouse.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'make' stand part of the clause."

Sir W. ROBSON said he did not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman through the whole of his remarks. The hon. Member said that in regard to the terms of compromise, hon. Gentlemen opposite had not been consulted and were free in regard to them. If the negotiations were referred to at all it was rather for the purpose of indicating that they might in a certain degree limit the Government's freedom of action and not in any way limit the freedom of action of hon. Gentlemen opposite. The Amendment raised three rather important and substantial points. The first was that it made it compulsory on the local authority to provide accommodation, without any qualification at all. In the next place it proposed to enact that the accommodation should be suitable. In the third place, the accommodation was to be in or adjoining the school. In regard to the first point, the Bill as it stood only put upon the local authority the obligation of providing such accommodation as was available. The Government had accepted suggestions which would make that provision possibly clearer, though he thought it was reasonably clear already. An Amendment by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire had been put down in the name of the Government so that it might not be subject to accidental exclusion, and under that Amendment the local authority would have to provide suitable accommodation in the schoolhouse where it was reasonably available, unless they satisfied the Board of Education that accommodation could not be made available without making structural alterations or additions. He thought when they came to deal with the Amendment in its turn it would be seen that it was a substantial advance, and was at all events worth considering. The next point was as to the suitability of the accommodation. That also was provided for in the proposals which they had upon the Paper. The third question was as to accommodation adjoining the school house. He did not think that the hon. Member had sufficiently reflected upon that point, because if the local authority was animated by the intentions which the hon. Gentleman ascribed to it, then to press this demand might have the effect of causing the local authority to send denominational teaching out of the school altogether. But even friendly authorities might be put under serious difficulty if the Amendment were adopted, because what the hon. Gentleman intended was, if there were no available accommodation in the school-house, that accommodation should be provided for them near the school. Let the Committee see what that involved in the case of a friendly authority. The hon. Member was seeking to put a heavy building obligation in many cases on the schools which belonged to the community at large, in order that the gratuitous use of those buildings thus erected might be at the disposal of the denominations. He thought that was pushing the right of entry much further than even hon. Gentlemen opposite should require. It was something more than a right of entry—it was a right to have buildings erected at the cost of the community for the express and particular use of certain denominations. He thought that the hon. Gentleman would see that he was going far beyond anything that the Government should feel disposed or entitled to give.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) thought that his hon. and learned friend would admit that this matter of the right of entry, in connection with which they were endeavouring to frame safeguards, was from their point of view one of the most important provisions in the Bill. It was about all the denominations were getting in this part of the Bill, unless they were willing to contract out of the national system of education. The apprehension seemed to be that the right of entry might not be a reality in some places. It should be remembered that it was their own voluntary schools which were going to be handed over to the local authorities, so that even their own schools built for the purposes of denominational education might be subject to the answer of the local authority that they had no room for denominational teaching. That was a very serious matter, and one which they could not let go without having given a good deal of consideration to it to see whether or not they were sufficiently safeguarded. There were many ways in which the right of entry might be safeguarded, but in the Bill there were no safeguards at all. In the first place, it was a very easy thing for a hostile local education authority—and they were already beginning to be a little frightened by the amount of literature they were receiving as to the way in which local authorities would work this compromise if the Bill were passed—to say that it had no accommodation available. It might be put forward, in a perfectly *bona fide* way, that there was no available accommodation; but what was to happen then? They took over the Church's denominational schools, and then the Church was to be told that there was to be no more denominational teaching in those schools. They would be incurring the risk, particularly in growing districts, when their schools were transferred, of having no available accommodaat all for denominational teaching. He thought that was a great blot on the Bill. It made one extremely suspicious as regarded the probability of the Bill's working, in some respects, as it was no doubt intended by the Government that it should work. The second point of his hon. friend was as to the Board of Education, in which denominationalists had not any very great confidence. He dared say that when the Unionists were in power there were Nonconformists who had not any great confidence in the Board of Education of that day. That was his point. What was the tribunal to whom they were going to refer these important points? It was a tribunal in which neither side at various times would have any confidence. That was extremely unsatisfactory, and there ought to be some means, if the local education authority raised these points, by which the parties would be satisfied that they would have their matters decided by a tribunal in which they had confidence. Therefore, if they placed the two points together, namely, that they were leaving the loophole, and in leaving the loophole, they were not setting up a tribunal in which the parties would have confidence, then they were very greatly minimising the satisfaction which they might otherwise feel with this provision of the Bill. He knew that there had been something said about accepting the Amendment of his right hon. friend, but it would still leave it open to the local education authority to say that they had no available accommodation, and that might occur in many cases. He would appeal to the Government not to leave this matter open to a hostile education authority, but close it up in the Bill, and make it say that in all these cases the right of entry should be a reality, and that no power to create obstacles to the exercise of it should be given to the local education authority.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that for his part he would not for worlds do anything unjust or ungenerous to any church, least of all to the Church, or to the mother Church of Rome, or to the daughter Churches known as Free. But he thought that there was a serious flaw in the argument of his hon. friend the Member for Blackpool, and in the argument of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, which invalidated both their speeches. They said that the right of entry was not fair, because preference was given to Cowper-Templeism over what was called denominationalism. But there was a fallacy in that. Cowper-Templeism was not a religion. That was the whole point. If he was right, then other churches, if Cowper-Templeism could not be called a church, were on the same footing. Cowper-Templeism was the sublimated essence of Christianity, a sort of State code of morals to which nobody could take any exception, and upon which the creed of any church might safely be grafted. He should say any creed but that of the Catholics, which practically was lost if the Catholic atmosphere was not preserved intact in youth and adolescence. Last night, the Deputy-Chairman had stopped him when he endeavoured to deal with this subject, but now that the Chairman was present, if he had two minutes, he could explain exactly the line that really existed between Cowper-Templeism and denominationalism. He would, however, have to trespass on the preserves of the hon. Member for Newbury, and go as far as China. At least he believed the hon. Member was Captain-General of the Chinoleptics, if indeed the corps had not been disbanded.

The CHAIRMAN: I really do not think we can re-discuss this question on every Amendment.

*Mr. REES said in that case he would say nothing about it. He would end where he began. He protested that the fallacy which was exhibited in the speeches of the hon. Member for Blackpool and of the noble Lord was that this endeavour to describe Cowper-Templeism as a religion, which no one could properly describe it as being, entirely falsified the whole of the argument. If it was true that it was a mere sublimated essence of Christianity, a mere code of morals, bearing the same relation in England to the Christian Churches as the code of Confucius bore in China to ancestor worship and Buddhism, where was the inequality and the injustice to other denominations? Upon such teaching might surely be grafted the teaching of the Church of England or of the Free Churches.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said the Amendment raised a question of policy of sufficient importance to make one regret that they should not have any Member of the Cabinet present. The Attorney-General said they could not have this Amendment, because it made it compulsory to provide accommodation for Church teaching. To him that was not an objection. They had to provide accommodation for Cowper-Temple teaching under the Bill. In the surrendered Church school why should it not be obligatory on the local authority to provide accommodation and facilities for that particular form of religion which had been given in that school for years? He wanted to raise a specific point dealing with a very disquieting answer given by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education yesterday. The hon. Member for Sowerby Bridge stated the other day in a letter to the newspapers that 1,000 schools in single-school parishes were schools of one room only, and in them there was to be no right of entry and no giving of denominational instruction. That was one-fifth of their schools gone. He wondered who told the hon. Member that. The hon. Member for Yarmouth asked a question on that point, and the Parliamentary Secretary refused to give any specific denial of the allegation that in the opinion of the Board of Education administrative reasons might be considered adequate to say that in a single-room school this teaching should not be given. That was a very serious state of things. There were 1,000 schools, and 980 of them probably were Church of England schools. A single-room school need not be a bad or an old building. He knew cases where people had put their hands in their pockets in recent years and paid a good deal of money to provide a school which was adequate for the population of the district but had only one room. It was evidently contemplated that in certain conditions the fact of its being a single-room school would be sufficient to exclude denominational teaching on the ground that the general conduct and discipline of the school and general administrative convenience would make it impossible. He wanted to exact a statement on that point across the floor of the House. He desired to know on what grounds it was fair to take away from the Church of England these 1,000 schools if in future the fact of their smallness would prevent them giving any more denominational instruction. It was a great and probably an admitted hardship. He did not know that it was originally contemplated, but here was a statement of a very well-informed Member, who represented a district which in the past had not been slow to take advantage of the opportunities of injuring voluntary schools, that was largely supported by the Board of Education.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he was, of course, not responsible for what was said by the hon. Member for Sowerby Bridge, and he hardly thought the report that the noble Lord had given was exactly correct of what he had said on behalf of the Board. What he had said was that in the case of single-room schools there would be a right of entry unless reasons of administrative convenience prevented it. The whole idea of the clause was that the right of entry should be as absolute as it could possibly be consistently with certain administrative difficulties which might arise, as they thought in very few of the schools, and possibly those few schools would be more single-room schools than any other.

SIR E. CARSON: How many single-room schools are there?

*MR. TREVELYAN said it was not exactly known. He went on to say in the answer it was not possible to lay down a hard-and-fast rule applicable to all single-room schools. Large numbers of them were already provided with partition screens and other means of separating them, which meant that administratively the right of entry would be easily practicable, or were otherwise suitable for the conduct of two or more classes. He had in his mind a quite small school in his own county, a comparatively small room where there were very often two classes taken at the same time. There was nothing administratively impossible in it, but there might be a few instances in which it would be impossible to have a right of entry, but he thought they would be very few. He thought hon. Members were acting really too much from a suspicious view of what the local authorities wanted to do. He took the very case with which they were always challenging them, the West Riding of Yorkshire, in which he represented a very Nonconformist constituency. It was perfectly true that the West Riding from 1902 onwards, through the county council, did in many respects work the Act of 1902 as far as it possibly could in the interest of what it regarded as the right settlement, that all schools should, as far as possible, be under the control of the local education authority, and they were admittedly not friendly to non-provided schools which were under their control. Everyone knew and admitted that. But in 1902 what was the condition of public opinion? In this county in which there was an enormous amount of Nonconformity, the whole of the Nonconformists were violently discontented. They did not all necessarily approve of the passive resister or of the strong measures taken by the county council, but they were to a man discontented. What was the state of things now in his constituency—one of the most Nonconformist in the West Riding? He had been reading in the papers with regard to the various people who lived in his constituency, leaders of opinion, on this Bill. In one part of the constituency, one of the leading Nonconformist ministers, strongly opposed to the Bill of 1902, was strongly in favour of the compromise, although of course he did not approve, as none of them did, of all the conditions of the Bill. The man who led the passive resistance movement accepted the Bill, and finally a man who was a passive resister and who went on to the county council because he was a passive resister also accepted the Bill, and expressed his intention of working it. The very people who were most anxious, as far as possible, to work the Act of 1902 in the interests of what they thought the public, as against the Church and the non-provided schools, were the men who at this moment were most ready to accept the Bill. He had no reason to suppose there were not a very large number of Nonconformists throughout the West Riding who wished to do the same, and if that state of things existed it was quite impossible to suppose that the county council of the West Riding would be allowed, even though there were a certain number of people who wished to make mischief upon it, to make the Bill a dead letter, and he believed that not only the county councils and the corporations which had hitherto taken a strong line, but even those local education authorities which, like the West Riding, had taken a rather questionable line from the hon. Member's point of view, were honestly intending to work the Bill. If he was right in thinking that, he felt that the anticipation of danger of hon. Gentlemen opposite were very much over-coloured. In the case of the single-room schools it was extremely likely, even if they had not on the top of the local education authority the control of the Education Board, that the Act would be honestly worked at the service of the Church of England. Finally, they accepted the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire because it gave in the most direct form possible an appeal to the Board of Education. In starting this new system he ventured to say that if they could get the local authorities, or most of them, in a reasonable frame of mind and ready to start, and if they could be sure of the system starting well, it was one which would be readily accepted and adhered to by the mass of the people of this country for many years to come. Some hon. Gentlemen opposite had expressed suspicion of the Board of Education. They had said that perhaps not the present Board, but another Board might be unwilling to work this Bill honestly. Even right hon. Gentlemen opposite could not think that of the present Board, because they could not suppose that the President of the Board of Education, if he got this Bill through, was not going to get this measure worked honestly. It was as much as his political reputation was worth if he did not carry out the measure honestly. In the next place they had the undoubted anxiety of the mass of the people through local authorities to work the measure honestly, and they had on the top of that, if they accepted the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire, the Education Department at present controlled by a man who was determined to make his Bill work and to see that the local authorities did their duty in regard to it.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he found himself differing from those of his hon. friends who had spoken in the course of this discussion. The hon. Member opposite had alluded to the distrust of the Board of Education as an ultimate and sole court of appeal. He agreed with the hon. Member who had just sat down that the President of the Board of Education, and any President they were likely to see in that office for some time to come, would do his best if this Bill were passed to make it work fairly. As far as the Amendment went it did not carry this matter any further.

Mr. ASHLEY said he dealt with the matter further in a subsequent Amendment.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that if they had a court of appeal it would apply to the whole working of the section. As regarded the Amendment before them, what was the difference between that and the one which the Government had accepted which stood in his name and which was framed by himself in consultation with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Hanover Square and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University? The Amendment which the Government had accepted placed a specific obligation on the local authority to make available any existing suitable accommodation, or to satisfy the Board of Education that it could not be made available, before the right of entry was refused. His hon. friend wished to say that where suitable accommodation was not available, and where it could not be provided, there the local education authority should be obliged to provide additional buildings by spending money. That was a demand which it was not possible for him to support. He had taken the main lines of the compromise as they were sketched in the Bill, and as they appeared in the correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the

Prime Minister, and he could not help feeling that what was proposed would be going outside those main lines. He should, therefore, remain contented with the concession the Government had made and he could not support the Amendment. The cases which his hon. friend had in mind were much fewer than the figures cited would lead the Committee to suppose. It did not follow because a school was a single room that accommodation would not be available. There were, as the Parliamentary Secretary had stated, cases where partitions might be put up, which were not structural alterations, in order to make the room available for that kind of instruction. He attached some importance to the fact that the provision included not only the schoolroom, but the master's house which was attached. In a case where there happened to be twenty-one scholars belonging to one denomination and ten belonging to another, it would be possible to allow the twenty-one to remain in the schoolroom and withdraw the other ten into the parlour of the master's house. He wished to point out that in many of these schools the minority would be the undenominational portion of the school. He thought the number of instances where they would not be able to provide the necessary accommodation would be very small indeed.

*Sir GEORGE WHITE (Norwich) said the picture which the right hon. Gentleman had drawn in regard to religious instruction being given in the teacher's house was likely to set the teacher's organisation more against the Bill than ever. He was sorry he could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman in that respect. Without any actual authority as to figures he doubted from his own knowledge of the rural districts whether there were anything like 1,000 single-room schools in the Kingdom. He had a strong suspicion that the hon. Member for Sowerby Bridge had in his mind single-teacher schools rather than single-room schools. At the same time he quite shared what the right hon. Gentleman said as to the possibility of making even single-room schools available for this special teaching without having recourse to the teacher's house which he should certainly not regard as a remedy for the difficulty. He had risen to try and allay some of the suspicions which appeared to actuate hon. Members opposite in regard to the conduct of local authorities. He invited hon. Members to survey the constitution of local authorities and especially county authorities. If there was any ground for such a suspicion it ought to exist in the minds of Nonconformists rather than in the minds of hon. Members opposite, for certainly in the case of county local authorities where they would have control of the vast number of transferred schools the party opposite were in a majority from a political point of view. He felt that whatever political party might be in a majority they would endeavour to administer the Bill fairly and reasonably towards all parties. He deprecated that feeling of suspicion which was almost worthy of a gentleman trying to buy a horse from another person rather than dealing with the religious difficulty. As to whether there would be accommodation available he had listened to the remarks of many hon. Members on the point and they appeared to have drawn a picture of six, eight, or ten different religious sections endeavouring to find accommodation in one schoolroom. Speaking for himself, he held the conviction that the Free Churches as a whole would not trouble the local authority to provide accommodation for classes to teach their own special doctrines. Speaking for the denomination to which he belonged he would be no party to any attempt to place religious teachers in any transferred schools to teach Nonconformist doctrines. He did not believe in the doctrines of his own or any other religion being taught in schools at the public expense. If the right of entry was fairly administered and no undue pressure was put upon parents to make their selection; if this measure was fairly and honestly administered on all sides both by the Board of Education and by those who had influence with the parents, he felt sure that Free Churches as a whole would not desire to have any representative teacher in those schools teaching their own doctrine. Therefore, it would resolve itself practically in most of the transferred schools where facilities were desired into either Anglicans or Roman Catholics, and in the vast majority of cases the special instruction would be for the Anglicans alone. Therefore, all the doubts as to whether there would be available accommodation for this special teaching might be set at rest, because the accommodation required so far as the number of class-rooms was concerned would be very limited. He hoped hon. Gentlemen opposite would feel that this was not an impossible condition, and the Board of Education if they desired honestly to administrate this clause would have no difficulty in the great majority of cases in doing it.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said he was not animated by any acute suspicion of the local authorities in this matter, but he wished to put it to the Secretary to the Board of Education that the wording of this clause, even as amended by his right hon. friend's Amendment, which the Government were ready to accept, would only suggest that there was a great difficulty in providing this accommodation in any school which only contained one room. If a local authority put that interpretation upon the wording of the Act they would not be liable to be accused of any unworthy conduct. It would be a mistake to suggest that this instruction could not be given in a school with only one room. Perhaps the hon. Member opposite was not aware that the Leader of the Opposition received the whole of his secular instruction before he went to a public school in a school with one room in which four classes were conducted.

*MR. TREVELYAN said that two years after that he was taught in the same room. He had already mentioned that he thought more than one class could be taught in a room.

MR. WYNDHAM said he did not hear the hon. Gentleman say that. That being so, he thought they would make a mistake if they were to suggest, as they would do by the language of the clause, to the local education authorities that there was some insurmountable difficulty in the way of giving religious instruction of a separate character for three-quarters of an hour in a school which had only one room. The Secretary to the Board of Education had told them that there were very few schools in which any pretence of a difficulty could arise. They had also been told that there were many schools in which no parents would desire to have this right of entry at all. He suspected that these two classes largely coincided, and that the cases in which any real difficulty could be put forward for not acting in the spirit of the Act must be few indeed. If that was so, would they not really make the task of the local education authorities easier, and not harder, if they said quite explicitly in the Bill that these facilities should be given? He could imagine the case of a local authority being very anxious to give these facilities, but being impressed by the opposition of some who took a more violent view of these matters, with the result that the local authority, looking to the fact that the school consisted of only one room, would say that the language of the Act did not clearly impose the obligation. He thought the local authority would have an easier task if, when pressure was put on them, they were able to say that the words of the Act required that facilities should be provided. That, he believed, was the intention of the Government, and it was also the course which the local authorities would almost in every case pursue.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he regretted that on the present occasion he must separate himself from the hon. Member for Blackpool. It appeared to him that this Amendment was really not the right of entry, but the right of construction, which was a very different thing. Construction must cost money, but his hon. friend had not explained from what fund that cost was to be defrayed. He had a shrewd suspicion, however, on reading the Amendment and the Bill together, that the fund would be the local rate. Thus, at a time when the passive resister had betaken himself to wholesome slumber, they would be adopting a course which would again arouse him to action. Such a step, he thought, would be a mistake. He was very much struck by what the Under-Secretary had said as to the sentiment of peace which now prevailed in his constituency. He knew something of that district, because many years ago he was the representative of that division of the West Riding, and he knew the intensity of the Nonconformist feeling in that most beautiful valley. It was a matter of great consolation to him to hear of the improved condition of feeling that the hon. Gentleman had described in such graphic terms. He desired most anxiously that this Bill should become law. He believed that if it did become law it would, duly amended, mean moderation where there had hitherto been extravagance, peace where there had been warfare, and co-operation where there had been constant antagonism.

*MR. NAPIER said he wished to make one observation in the hope that it would calm the fears of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He was certain they were anxious that those fears should be calmed. He assumed that the calculation was right that there were 900 schools in the country which had only a single room available for teaching, and that even according to the calculation of hon. Gentlemen opposite only about three county councils might be recalcitrant. There were about sixty county councils altogether in England. That meant that one-twentieth might conceivably have intentions hostile to the Act, and might endeavour, so far as they could, to refuse facilities. If it was assumed that the single-room schools were spread tolerably equally over the whole country, that would bring the House to the conclusion that there were forty-five single-room schools in the possibly recalcitrant counties. How would the position stand in relation to them? There might be partitions in some of these schoolrooms, and, if not, partitions could be put up. If the Government accepted the Amendment of the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for East Worcestershire, as they had expressed their intention of doing, the Board of Education would be able to compel the county councils to put up partitions in all the single-room schools, so that the whole difficulty would be reduced to nothing at all.

MR. RAWLINSON said that this Amendment, if it stood alone, would not be of serious importance. He wished to point out that, as the Bill stood now, there was no sort of obligation on the local education authority to carry out what was intended in this matter. He concurred with the hon. Member for North-West Norfolk in deprecating suspicions on one side or the other. But lawyers knew that nothing was more liable to lead to unpleasantness and litigation than for one party to an agreement to say to the other party: "Do not be suspicious of me, do not put it down in black and white, and I will not be suspicious of you." The hon. Gentleman himself would not have attained his present position if he had conducted his business on those lines. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education had referred to the position in the West Riding of Yorkshire. There were pretty keen business men in that part of the country, and if one or two passive resisters had said that they were quite content with what the Government proposed, it might be taken that they knew how the proposed arrangement would work. If he might give the local authority a bit of gratuitous legal advice he would advise them that they would be perfectly safe in signing this document, for he believed that there was absolutely no remedy against them in case they did not fulfil their side of the bargain. It was not a question of suspicion or of personal trust of the President of the Board of Education. It was better to have these things in black and white so that no dispute could afterwards arise. If the Government really meant to make the providing of accommodation, so far as practicable, obligatory, some general words should be put into this Bill as had been done in the Children Bill this year. Once the duty was put on the local education authorities in that way, there would be a remedy against those who might be recalcitrant. If the course he suggested were followed, local education authorities would be able to hold the balance evenly as between Nonconformists and denominationalists. Unless the Government saw their way to meet this point, it seemed to him that the Committee were being asked, so to speak, to sign a document which involved confidence on the other side in regard to a matter which should be put clearly in black and white.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 307; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 427.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.

Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W.Howell (Bristol,S.
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fletcher, J. S.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch,George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gulland, John W.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col.Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey

Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren,RtHnSir C.B.(Leices.)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Francis Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,CaptHn A.C.(Kincard.)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Snowden, P,
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset E
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Kean, John
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Srand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ)
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Winterton, Earl
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Ashley and Mr. F. E. Smith.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 27th November, successively to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of the Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given and the Question necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Seven of the Clock this day.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 27, to leave out the word 'available any,' and to insert the word 'suitable.'"

"In page 2, line 28, to leave out the words 'which can,' and to insert the words 'available unless they satisfy the Board of Education that accommodation cannot.'"

"In page 2, line 28, at end, to insert the words 'without making structural alterations or additions to the schoolhouse.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 31, after the second word 'and,' to insert the words 'such instruction shall be entered on the time-table and the children receiving it shall be subject to the ordinary discipline of the school in the same manner as when receiving any other instruction.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 293; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 428.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn Sir H.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Black, Arthur W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chance, Frederick William
Cleland, J. W.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, Sir James
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grant, Corrie
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gulland, John W.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Dt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmsley, Viscount
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Houston, Dobert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)

Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Lehmann, D. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Lyttelton Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Rt. Hn. Sir C. B. (Leices)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. G.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A C. (Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Ratcliff, Major D. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rendall, Athelstan
Renwick, George
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rose, Charles Day
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thos. P.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Crooks, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Fenwick, Charles
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Kekewich, Sir George
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Maddison, Frederick
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Snowden, P.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Vivian, Henry

Walsh, Stephen
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Hutton and Dr. Hazel.

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 276; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 429.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSir J.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A.(Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cowan, W. H.
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell (Bristol,S
Dickinson,W. H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Duckworth, Sir James
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone,Rt Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew,W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Grant, Corrie
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guinness, Hon. R.(Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S.Edm.)
Gulland, John W.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmsley, Viscount
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren,Rt.Hn.SirC.B.(Leices.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. G.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts,Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Percy, Earl
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradf'rd,E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rendall, Athelstan
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw,Sir CharlesEdw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheffield,SirBerkeley GeorgeD.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset, E
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker,Rt Hn.SirThomasP.
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmar'n)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clynes, J. R.
Collings,Rt.Hn. J.(Birm'gham)
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Hall, Frederick
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kekewich, Sir George
Lamb,Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras, E.
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Maddison, Frederick
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Renwick, George
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Snowden, P.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walsh, Stephen
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Hutton and Mr. Clement Edwards.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Runciman*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment of Parliamentary Grants to associations of schools in respect of every public elementary school belonging to such associations, and of a Parliamentary Grant in respect of instruction given in special subjects at centres, in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to make further provision with respect to Elementary Education in England and Wales."

Resolution read a second time.

*MR. TREVELYAN said his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education had asked him to move the Report of this Resolution, because under the rules of the House he would not be able to speak twice, and he wished to hear the criticisms which might be desired to be made by the other side before he answered at a later stage of the proceedings. At this stage, there was, he thought, no need for him to go at any length into the position of the Government. The Prime Minister had said that what the Government proposed and desired was that contracted-out denominational schools should be given a reasonable chance of existence, leaving, however, a substantial burden to be borne by the denomination. He thought the main part of the House was on common ground, at any rate in theory, with regard to these schools. They all agreed that it was educationally disadvantageous to have any large number of contracted-out schools. Therefore, they did not want to encourage needlessly contracting-out. They were also aware that there was, in certain classes of the community, a conscientious dislike to the terms under which most of the schools were asked to accept a national settlement, and, therefore, it was not desired to make contracting-out impossible. Since this discussion had started, a certain number of Members of the House and of people outside the House had been practically, if not actually, asking the Government to make the grants equivalent to the present rates. So far as the Government were concerned, that, or anything like that, was impossible, because where then would be the national settlement—[AN HON. MEMBER: Where is it now ?] —if all the thousands of contracted-out schools were to have an easy opportunity of standing out of a national system ? The view of the Government was that there must be a real and substantial burden on the schools which stood out, but that there must not be required of them any ruinous sacrifice.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Semi-starvation.

*MR. TREVELYAN said his right hon. friend had had figures put before him by the representatives of various denominations, but he did not believe that any denomination had proved that the figures of the Government would not meet both those requirements. His right hon. friend invited criticism, but the more he examined the figures put forward by the Government, and when he considered the pooling arrangements of the grants according to the size of the schools, the more satisfied his right hon. friend was that the Government estimate was about right—namely, that something like 85 per cent. of the maintenance of the schools would be provided by the Government grants, and that something like 15 per cent. would remain to be found by the denominations. If those figures were correct, it was for the House to decide, after discussion, whether that was too much to ask the Churches who stood out of the national settlement to pay for the sake of privately controlling the schools and of the private patronage it brought. He begged to move.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Before the hon. Gentleman sits down, can he tell us how the negotiations now stand with the Archbishop of Canterbury ?

MR. TREVELYAN: My right hon. friend will say something about that, but I am not in a position to say anything about it.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford), said that apparently the hon. Gentleman believed that nothing could be a national settlement unless it inflicted some sacrifice upon a large minority. He had risen for the purpose of entering a protest against the extraordinary position in which the House was placed at that moment. When the other night they were trying to discuss, indirectly at any rate, the first Schedule to this Bill and the amount of the grant to be provided, they were told that the Government were still considering this question and had asked for figures from various denominations, that they had received some of these figures and were making elaborate calculations with regard to them, and that when those calculations were completed, the Government would to-day on this Motion through the lips of the Prime Minister make a statement as to what the financial arrangement was to be. Yet, in the face of that pledge, they are now asked to commence a discussion upon the financial basis of the Bill without any financial statement whatever being made, without knowing whether they were discussing the first Schedule or not——

MR. RUNCIMAN: I can tell the hon. Gentleman at once. It is the first Schedule of the Bill and I take it that is the one we are now discussing.

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked whether he was to take it from that that the negotiations had led to nothing. Was he to understand from that that the Government stood or fell by the Schedule and by the Schedule alone, or was he to understand that the Schedule was to be increased or enlarged? They were entitled to some better treatment than that. He submitted that that was trifling with the House. He ought to be informed whether the first Schedule contained the whole financial programme of the Government, or whether the Government were still considering whether that Schedule should be enlarged, whether they were still negotiating on the question as to whether it should be enlarged or not. If the matter was still in suspense, he honestly thought the discussion should be adjourned. If the Government were negotiating to see how much further they could go to satisfy those who were asking for more, ought the discussion to go on? Through long years he had witnessed a series of new rules of procedure in the House which, he agreed with the Leader of the Opposition, had gradually reduced the House to a position almost of contempt, but he did not know of any instance in the past of such utter contempt of the House of Commons as that of asking them solemnly to undertake the discussion of the financial basis of this Bill when the Government would neither tell them whether they were negotiating and endeavouring to enlarge that basis, nor on the other hand, whether they were going to stand by that basis. What were they going to discuss? Were they going to discuss this 49s. 6d. per child? What was the use of discussing it if they were at that very moment engaged in discussion and negotiation to see whether they could not go further to meet the further claims which had been made? He thought the House of Commons was being treated badly in the matter, and speaking for those whom Irish Members represented, he thought they had grave reason to complain. They were told their figures were disputed. They were asked to submit them for examination. Their figures had been submitted to examination. The most full and detailed statistics had been collected—not from Blue-books or general averages; he doubted if the Church of England had done the same—but statistics drawn from every individual Catholic school in England. They had been examined now for many days, and would it be believed that at that moment when they were asked to undertake this discussion, they had received from those to whom they had submitted the figures no statement of any sort or kind as to whether their figures were correct or incorrect, or as to what was the opinion of the Government experts upon them? He thought they had grave reason to complain. Up to this moment they had heard nothing whatever from the Government with reference to the figures, and he drew from that fact this conclusion: that the experts of the Government and the Education Office had found it impossible substantially to differ from their figures. Now he would, in a few words—because he did not want to make a long speech—deal with the various general aspects of the question at the moment. He felt it was almost useless to do so when they did not know what the position of the Government was or what their proposals were, but he felt it his duty the moment this financial aspect of the question came up, to put their case with reference to these Schedules. Now the figures they had proposed were drawn from each individual school in the country, and they went to show that the total expenditure on the Catholic schools of England and Wales at this moment was £830,000 a year. Taking the proposed grant of the Government in this schedule at 50s. per child—that was something more than the amount of the grant—it would amount to £712,000, leaving a deficit of £120,000 for the Catholic schools of England and Wales. The President of the Board of Education spoke the other day of their having claimed a deficit of £300,000 upon their schools. No responsible person made any such statement. Was it made by anyone on these benches?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: No, I did not say it was made by anyone in the House. I said the statements were made on behalf of the Roman Catholic authorities and I quoted the statement.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: By whom was it made?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: It was made by one of the dignataries of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the name? I utterly deny it was ever made by any responsible person. It might have been made in newspapers, but so far as the responsible leaders in this House, or responsible leaders outside it were concerned, no such statement was made. The statement made was that there would be a deficit of £120,000 for the whole of England and Wales. Of these figures they challenged contradiction. He would take by way of illustration, first of all, London. He had the estimate of the deficit in London prepared by the diocesan authority. Excluding the charge for furniture—he would deal with that in a moment—it amounted to £34,094. The authorities, in order to make sure that they were right, had these figures checked by the London County Council—the Education Authority—and he had there the official figures of the London County Council. The salaries alone amounted to £83,600, or 58s. 8d. per head; wear and tear, £1,068 15s., or 9d. per child; cleaning, £8,906 5s., or 6s. 3d. per child; books, £5,225, or 3s. 8d. per child; total maintenance, £15,200, or 10s. 8d. per child. Total cost, including salaries and maintenance, £98,800 a year, or 69s. 4d. per head. The grant proposed in the Schedule was £70,705, or 49s. 8d. per head, a deficit of £28,085 per year, or 19s. 8d. per head.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): What is the total per child?

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said the total of maintenance and salaries now was £98,800, or 69s. 4d. per child, in the Catholic schools. The grant according to the Schedule for salaries and maintenance would be £70,705 or 49s. 8d. per child per annum, which left a deficit of £28,085 per annum, or 19s. 8d. per head. Take the salaries alone. They amounted now to £83,600; the total given by the Schedule for salaries was £70,755; therefore in London alone there would be a deficit on salaries, not to speak of anything else, of £12,825. The right hon. Gentleman would notice that he was not including in the charges maintenance or any of the matters mentioned in the White Paper to which he took exception the other night as not fairly to be counted as maintenance. He was only taking salaries, wear and tear, cleaning, and books. If they included furniture it raised the amount very much. How did furniture stand? The moment this Bill passed, the furniture would cease to belong to the Catholic schools. The whole of it would be taken away from them altogether, or they would have to pay for it either in a lump sum or have the amount spread over a number of years. These were the County Council figures which he was quoting now, not the figures of the diocesan authorities. If they included furniture then they had £83,600 for salaries; for maintenance, £15,200; for furniture, £4,631 5s., or 3s. 3d. per head; and the total cost of maintenance, furniture and salaries was £103,431 5s.; less the amount of grant, £70,775; leaving a deficit of £32,656 5s., or 22s. 11d. per child. That brought the checked figures of the London County Council within between £2,000 and £3,000 of the figure which was originally quoted by the diocesan body. He quoted these figures as an illustration of the figures given by the Catholic body, as a checked and authorised statement of the case in London, and as a proof that their total figure of £120,000 a year deficit over the whole country was a correct figure. But it might be said that while he was sure of his figures which had been checked as to London, he could not say the same for the rest of the country. He had the total figures for Liverpool, which also had been checked by the local education authority of the town council. They showed a deficit in Liverpool of £11,500 a year in the thirty-five schools. They had got the details of other places in England and Wales. He did not want to quote them all, but he wished to give two or three illustrations in order to impress upon the House the accurary of their figures, which had been checked by the local education authorities. If he took smaller places, he found that in Widnes there was a deficit of £1,039; and in Warrington—he quoted these small places in order to make his illustration complete—the deficit was £487. All through, these figures, as checked by the local authorities, went to show that their estimate of £120,000 a year deficit over the whole of England on the Schedule of the right hon. Gentleman was an accurate figure. Let him deal with one other matter. It had been suggested to them that by the system of pooling, as it was called, they would be able to redress the balance, and that the great loss of £32,000 in London would be made up by the profit on the 50s. per child in other parts of England and Wales. They had gone most elaborately into those figures, and the pooling would be of absolutely no use to them at all. According to the figures which he had there were only two dioceses in England or Wales where there would be a profit, and in both the profit was insignificant. In the diocese of Menevia in Wales, he was told that there would be a profit of £340; and there would be a profit in Newport of £1,440. He was told that in no other diocese in England and Wales would there be any profit. Of what use was this pooling; of what advantage was it to Catholics? Where were the schools in London to look for the £32,000 a year to enable them to make up that enormous deficit? The pooling was of absolutely no use. The Schedule as it stood, even with this pooling, meant for the Catholic schools of England semi-starvation and practical ruin. What would happen? If it were carried out, well-paid teachers would have to be dismissed and badly-paid teachers put in their place. The small classes into which these schools had been properly broken up of recent years would have to be amalgamated. They could not by any possibility have efficient schools even if the cost of education remained as it was, but they all knew the cost of education was rising and would rise, and in point of fact when he quoted the county council figures for these schools in London he had understated the case, because the salaries, £83,600, giving 58s. 8d. per head had since then been raised 2s. per head, and the figures he gave therefore were to that extent underestimates. They knew that the cost would increase rapidly. This system would mean for their schools inefficiency, starvation, and destruction. His colleagues and he took the strongest view against the whole principle of contracting-out. They were opposed to it root and branch, but he did not think that was the right opportunity for him to argue the principle of contracting-out, and he wanted to confine himself simply to the finance of the Bill, which was ruinous to these schools. He complained that their figures which were sent to be checked, if they had been checked, had not received the attention of the Government. If they had been found to be correct they ought to have been told of it. If they had been found to be incorrect they also ought to have been told so. He complained of the way they had been dealt with in this matter. He complained of the way the House of Commons had been dealt with. He had, during those few moments, been discussing the Schedule. He felt bound on the first opportunity to state their case and give their figures, but in a sense he was beating the air. He was talking about a Schedule which, for all he knew, did not exist, a mere shadow, and they were entitled to know from the right hon. Gentleman did the Government stand by its Schedule. If it did not, what Schedule did it stand by? At any rate, so far as they were concerned, speaking on the figures in the Schedule and from the statistics he had quoted, nothing could induce them to refrain from the most vehement opposition to every stage of the Bill.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) said that from the first he had desired a settlement of this question, but he had stated, and he trusted made clear, to the House that that desire was subject to the reservation that equitable treatment among other things should be shown to contracting-out schools and upon the question of transfer. He wanted to associate himself with the hon. Member who had just spoken when he said that in this matter it was not fair that the House should be kept so much in the dark as it had been day after day, and that those who favoured the settlement of this matter should be compelled to cast their vote in a state of uncertainty upon subjects of great importance. They were compelled to sink their opinions for the time being in expectation of promises being fulfilled when no means had been afforded and no statement of any sort had been made which would enable the House to decide whether those promises could be fulfilled. They were in the dark as to the finance of the Bill and as to the most important question of training colleges. Until that day he had had no communicaton with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had thought it was more desirable to conduct the negotiations apart from Members of the House. But the Archbishop had made a communication to him on this subject which it was right that the Government and theHouse should know. He held in the strongest way that it was the duty of the Government, having at their command the experience and the resources of the Education Department, to justify their own figures, and to give the House a perfectly clear statement as to the material on which they based them. His personal view was that the figures in the circumstances should be liberal and generous, and, above all, that the House should have time to consider them. The Government had not taken that view, however. On the contrary, they had asked the Church of England, the Roman Catholics, and those who dissented from the Bill and wished to stand outside its provisions, to bring forward their own figures and to justify them, they having nothing approaching the opportunity, experience, or organisation which the Board of Education had, and he presumed from the attitude they had taken up in regard to this schedule they intended to criticise those figures. Let the House not mistake him. He did not deny that, so far as he could judge, there had been great difficulty in getting any definite figures on such a vast subject in a short space of time. He proposed, however, to rely for the validity of the position which was taken up by the Archbishop in this matter on the official figures supplied by the Department. In the communication received from the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed to the President of the Board of Education it was stated that the figures for the transfer schools were utterly inadequate, and that the amount which would be demanded on the basis of the Government proposals from the voluntary schools would be a contribution of 14s. 6d. per child. These were the views of the Archbishop—

> "The transfer and contracting-out provisions must be looked at as a whole. It is clear, therefore, that if the contracting-out schools are to be maintained efficiently without an impossible strain upon voluntary subscribers the amount of the grants set out in the schedule must be increased in each case at least 7s., and there must be a further provision that they are to rise automatically year by year with the average expenditure for the whole country as set forth on page 3 of the White Paper already referred to. Unless you can concede these essential matters, I am obliged to say that the schedule will, in my opinion, take away what the Bill purports to give, and consequently it would seem that the settlement which seemed attainable as the result of our correspondence cannot be carried out. In that case it would be useless to discuss the many important points which seem to me to call for amendment in the Bill itself, and especially in Clause 2 with regard to facilities. It gives me genuine distress that I should thus be obliged to contemplate at this stage of our discussion a result which, in my view at least, would be a real calamity to the interests of educational and religious peace; but I feel that it is necessary to speak explicitly on what, as you will know, I have regarded from the first as an essential part of any scheme of settlement. I am so well assured of your desire being in harmony with my own that I will not despair of your being able to take such steps as are possible for making your whole scheme a consistent and practical one, and thus effecting what will in the long run—despite present

criticism and fears—redound to the country's good."

In a postscript it was added that—

"The Representative Church Council meets on Thursday, and will reasonably expect from me a definite statement."

No settlement either differing from or in accord with the representations of that letter had been made by the right hon. Gentleman, and it appeared that the Archbishop, who had shown the most earnest zeal in the interests of peace, had found the financial provisions of the Bill utterly inadequate. He claimed that the Archbishop had shown great moderation in the statement of his views, though he wished to guard himself from accepting fully the standard which the Primate had mentioned as the minimum which he could possibly accept. He did this because he had heard the statement of the last speaker, and he had also before him the White Paper which seemed to him to prove that the Archbishop's request was a very moderate one in the circumstances. This Paper showed that the expenditure per child over the country was 64s. 10d. He was aware that this figure had been repudiated on behalf of the Government as containing matters regarding deductions of an important character. He had tried to look into the question, and he declared that the Paper as it stood was meant for the information of the public and not for the benefit of educational experts. What were the deductions which the President of the Board of Education had indicated ought to be made? He agreed that some deductions ought to be made in respect ot the conveyance of children to schools—a trifling matter. There were deductions which he dared say would amount to 3s. 4d. per child for rates and insurance of school buildings. There was a deduction which could properly be made and which would come to very little for the purchase of land and the erection, alteration, and maintenance of school buildings. He agreed that where a school was purchased a deduction would have to be made, but he did not think the right hon. Gentleman would say that was an expenditure which had to be made except in very rare instances. He invited the right hon. Gentleman to show that the deductions referred to were not balanced by the additions which would necessarily fall on the contracting-out schools. The White Paper did not show the real average expenditure, because the general standard of the voluntary schools had not reached its highest point. In the next place, the country schools brought the whole average down, and he submitted that the vast number of country schools would not be able to contract-out at all. That was an important set-off against some of the deductions which he admitted had to be made. Take a more important matter still. The contracting-out schools would have the whole upkeep laid upon their shoulders, a most formidable item which did not exist at the present time. Then, lastly, there were the administrative charges, which the White Paper eliminated altogether. These could not be taken altogether off the contracting-out schools, for in future the whole administrative charges would fall on the contracting-out authority. He was informed that as far as an investigation had been able to be made by the authorities of the Church of England in the short time available, the figures gained from 140 schools in divers parts of the country seemed to corroborate the conclusions arrived at in the White Paper—namely, that 64s. 10d. was the average and legitimate expenditure which was made by the local authorities on the schools of the country. It seemed to him, therefore, that the request of the Archbishop—namely, that the rough average grant of 50s. should at the very least be added to by 7s.—was a moderate demand on the face of the only figures they had before them on official authority. He did not for one moment wish to underrate the case presented by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, and it was quite obvious from the greater consolidation and concentration of the schools for which he spoke that they had been able to get fair, complete, and accurate statistics, and therefore they were able to draw from them a more definite conclusion. All he wished to say was that the Archbishop's request seemed to be considerably under rather than over the cost. He wished to say that it had been to the honour of those who had spoken upon that side that they had firmly declared that contracting-out schools were never to fall below the provided schools of the country, and the Civil Lord of the Admiralty, in the speech he made, indicated that progress would involve further expense. Was it really to be contended that under a concordat and settlement which many of them wished to see carried through, the schools of the Church of England and the Roman Catholics as well should be placed upon a far lower standard than that which was enjoyed by their rival schools in the country? The effort of peace which was being made upon the basis of contracting-out was only being accepted on condition that those who accepted it would subject themselves to a strain far more intolerable than they endured before 1902. He wished to say in conclusion that he did not desire to use any provocative word upon this matter. The settlement, if it was to be a settlement, ought not to break down upon a point of finance. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] Well, it ought not to break down on that point. There were far greater sacrifices to be made by both sides. There were sacrifices of most dearly-loved and cherished convictions which had to be made by hon. Members on both sides. And he said with absolute sincerity that it would be absolutely useless to ask people to make such sacrifices of convictions which were dear to them if there was at the same time to be placed on the shoulders of those making them a burden quite intolerable, which would condemn these schools to a lower standard of efficiency.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE said that, although many of them had heard the speech of the right hon. Gentleman with very great regret, and specially the communication from the Archbishop, none could find any fault with the tone of the speech. He should endeavour to emulate that tone. He could not, however, agree with the expression of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to a question of this sort breaking down on a matter of finance when the matter of finance was so intimately connected with one of the essential principles of the Bill. He had at different periods of the history of educational controversies said that under certain conditions he might agree to the right of entry, and that under certain conditions he might agree to contracting-out, but under no circumstances that he could foresee could he agree to the two operating in one area; and yet to a certain extent that was the position in which they were placed by this Bill. They were brought to that condition of things solely by the belief that at least those belonging to the Anglican Church would have been very largely, if not wholly, content with the operation of the principle of the right of entry, and would not have sought to enlarge the opportunities for contracting-out. Therefore, he was quite sure the House would see that the question of finance was so intimately connected with this great principle that it was impossible to look upon it as a light matter. What would be the position of those who had received a good deal of blame from their friends already if they consented to the right of entry in the towns and in other districts not single school areas—placing them in the position in which he believed they would be placed if they acceded to the figure named by the right hon. Gentleman and allowed the right of entry in all the council schools, at the same time giving every facility for contracting out for the whole of the denominational schools if they chose to do so? They could not face such a figure as that which was named by the right hon. Gentleman because they felt that sum would place every possible facility, so far as finance was concerned, in the way of contracting out. In the course of a long life he had had a good deal to do with educational figures, and he was bound to say that there was no class of figures which laid themselves open to so much misrepresentation and misunderstanding; therefore, it would be an extremely difficult thing to get at what was the exact cost of education under all the circumstances under which those contracting-out schools would exist. From his own experience and knowledge, as well as from the information he had been able to gather, he felt that the figure which the Government had put into the Schedule was a liberal figure. Bearing in mind always the limitation which they had endeavoured to place upon the contracting-out system, namely, that those who engaged in it should at least have some reasonable sum to subscribe themselves as they did years ago under similar circumstances, they could not watch that sum absolutely disappearing and be content to go on with this arrangement under those conditions. He took up this position with very great regret, and he did so because they had reached a stage in the compromise which was a very serious one indeed. He would go so far as to state that the position of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the future attitude which the education authority might take in the interest of education in all the schools of the country would not be an unreasonable position, or that those demands as they applied to contracted-out schools should be reasonably met by the Board of Education in regard to future finance. He thought that was a reasonable proposition, but in regard to the present situation for him and his friends, with the figures before them which they had endeavoured to get as accurately as they possibly could, to consent to a condition of things in which they would be promptly charged with handing over the whole of the town schools to denominational schools, either through contracting out or the right of entry, would be to assume a position of which he for one could not take the responsibility, and he felt if this demand was persisted in, he personally should have to use all the influence he possessed to bring the compromise to an end. He hoped they had not even yet reached that position. He trusted the President of the Board of Education would be able to put figures before the Committee—figures which ought to be authentic, for the Board of Education was certainly the only body so far as he knew who could really ascertain what was the exact expenditure for education in the country. He was quite sure they all credited the right hon. Gentleman with the desire to put the facts as they were before the Committee and give the best information at their disposal. He would fain hope that there was some way out of the position in which they found themselves. He felt that there was a great difficulty also in regard to his hon. friends below the gangway. What he had to say in regard to them he would put in the form of a question, and he hoped it would not be misinterpreted. He presumed that his hon. friends had in calculating the cost of their schools calculated the full salaries paid by the local authorities to all their teachers. They were perfectly justified in so calculating the salaries, but at the same time the deficiency between what the grant would yield and the amount of the expenditure credited to the salaries paid by the local authorities could not be said to be altogether a loss to their Church. It was a matter in which non-Catholics had no right to interfere in the slightest degree, but still it was a matter they might very well take into consideration in calculating what was the actual pecuniary difference which they would have to make up as against what they now received from the local authorities. He very much regretted to have to make this statement. He had certain responsibilities which had induced him to make it thus early, but he did not yet give up all hope that some way might be seen out of this dilemma. He was sure that if hon. Gentlemen would try to understand the position of those he represented, namely, that at this moment there was a prospect of all their town schools being practically in a greater or less degree put under denominational influence, they would feel that he was justified in taking up this position.

MR. DILLON said that while recognising the sympathetic and generous tone of the speech of the hon. Member for North West Norfolk he thought it must be evident to everyone in the House that the Catholic schools had no *locus standi* in this compromise. He must say a word in support of the position taken up by the hon. Member for Waterford. The hon. Member opposite seemed to have forgotten that the House were now discussing the financial Resolution, on which the First Schedule of the Bill depended. They were in the awkward position of not having had the statement in regard to the finances of the Bill promised by the Prime Minister, which was necessary to enable them in a really rational and useful way to discuss this Resolution. Although they had been led to believe that the mind of the Government was not made up and that the

Schedule was being revised, they were now debating in ignorance of what the mind of the Government was. The hon. Member for North West Norfolk had made an obscure hint as to the effect of the deficit which from carefully prepared figures the Catholic representatives had shown would fall upon their Church. He did not understand the hon. Member's remark, and he could only guess at its meaning. He presumed that there was an impression abroad that they would have to sweat the nuns, and that the Catholic Church had a certain body who would teach for nothing. That was a complete delusion. Those bodies did teach in some of the Catholic schools, and their teaching was so much sought after that it had been a matter of great embarrassment to find a considerable number of Protestants coming into their schools. These Protestants came in without being asked. Was it not very mean, though the nuns were earning their living and because they lived on very little, to take up the position, as the hon. Member had done, that they ought to be paid on a lower scale?

*SIR GEORGE WHITE said what he meant was that when the Education Act of 1902 came into force a great number of salaries of Catholic teachers were certainly doubled, or at all events very largely increased by their being placed as they were bound to be on the *status* of other teachers. It was acknowledged at that time that those teachers were receiving small salaries, and that they in the interest of their Church were doing what was practically mission work. He did not deny for one moment that these teachers had a right to do what they liked with the salaries paid to them, but these salaries had been increased by many thousands of pounds by the Act of 1902.

MR. DILLON said he knew the hon. Member too well to imagine that he was so ungenerous as to suggest that the salaries of Catholic teachers should be cut down again. After all, in this matter a man was entitled to a fair wage, and it was most ungenerous and unfair—he did not make any charge against the hon. Member—to go behind and ask what he did with the money. They were not entitled to do that. Were they going to fine men or women because they had devoted the wages they received for work done to a religious purpose? Were they going to say to them: "We will fine you, and reduce your wages, because you choose to devote those wages to some purpose we do not approve of"? They had no right to do that. Any public teacher who did his work had as good a right to draw his wages as any teacher in the country. It was an extraordinary position for anyone to take up to say that, as a condition of the national settlement, the salaries of the Catholic teachers in this country should be fined down below those of other teachers.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE: I never made any suggestion of the kind.

MR. DILLON: I do not think the hon. Member fully gave the bearing of his remark, but if it had any meaning it meant that——

*SIR GEORGE WHITE: I disavow any such intention.

MR. DILLON asked how on earth salaries were to be kept up if the Catholic teachers did not come on the same scale as others. If they were not so paid, the deficit would fall upon the Catholic body. He wished to know how they could discuss Clause 3 to-morrow unless they knew fully the financial aspect of the question. The representatives of the Catholics had stated over and over again that they were opposed to contracting out; they had pointed out the dangers they foresaw; but they had never denied that their attitude towards the granting of contracting out would be largely modified by the amount of money they were going to receive. If the hon. Member opposite had indicated a sliding scale which would move in accordance with the general course of education in the country, and place Catholic schools in a permanent position of equality with the other schools of the country, that would largely modify their objection to contracting out. He still adhered to his view that the other settlement would be better, but how could they approach the discussion of Clause 3 until they knew the final decision of the Government in regard to the Schedule and contracting-out? Contracting-out might be tolerable if they were going to get a fair grant, but it would be intolerable if it meant the slow starvation of their schools. He had received that morning a resolution passed by the Synod of the United Diocese of Cork and Ross strongly protesting against the closing of certain small schools, on the ground that it would be a gross injustice to the members of their Church, namely, the Protestant Church in Ireland. He would point out that in Ireland there was a regulation that wherever Protestants were in a small minority in a Catholic parish, if they could gather not thirty but ten children they had a school of their own, paid for entirely out of public funds and under Protestant management, and without any inequality whatsoever. He asked the House to compare that with the treatment given to Catholic schools in this country. The hon. Member for North-West Norfolk reminded Catholics the other day that they were only a small minority asking that there should be Catholic schools with Catholic teachers in a Protestant country. There was a minority of Protestants in Ireland, which was a Catholic country. Supposing the Irish people got Home Rule to-morrow, or even if they did not get it, supposing they had popular control of education in Ireland, and they said: "We are a Catholic country, and we decline to give to the Protestants of Ireland their Protestant schools." Supposing they said further: "We shall set up in this Catholic country that form of religious teaching which is acceptable to the majority of the population; we will establish and endow that religious teaching in the schools of Ireland"; and, supposing that they said to the Protestants of Ireland who were in the minority, that they might contract-out, but if they did they must be prepared to bear a considerable burden for the privilege of contracting-out. They had suffered too long to attempt anything of the kind, and if they had Home Rule to-morrow they would not close one of the Protestant schools. But supposing they did; and that the Protestant minority in Ireland came over here and appealed to the party opposite for justice against such oppression, how could they answer them if they were going to do to the Catholics of this country precisely what the Protestants of Ireland would then complain of? They were not teaching them a good lesson in Ireland by this conduct. Last year, when this question was first raised, the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and other Protestants came to him personally and appealed to him to go to the Government to save their small Protestant schools, and he saw the Chief Secretary on the subject. He had a letter of thanks from the Provost of Trinity College for his assistance in keeping these small Protestant schools open. They did not require to get thirty children to keep them open as was proposed here. Some of these small Protestant schools had only ten children, and in some parishes in the South of Ireland only half a dozen, but these small schools were paid for in every respect the same as the Catholic schools. The question of religious equality was not affected by this question of the rates. In Ireland the education system was a State system. What he was asking here on this particular matter was not assistance from the rates, but assistance from the taxes. Again he asked, were they setting Ireland a good example in this matter? He contended that the facts proved that the Catholic majority in Ireland were more broad-minded and more generous to the Protestant minority than the Protestant majority in this country were in their treatment of the Catholic minority. Before he sat down he wanted to point out that there was another element of inequality in this treatment which made his case stronger in the matter of the upkeep of the school buildings. In Ireland the Protestant minority was the minority of wealth; they were the landlords and the professional classes, and could well afford to bear this burden of the upkeep of the buildings; but here it was proposed to inflict this fine for conscience' sake—for, whatever might be said to the contrary, it was a fine for conscience' sake—on the poorest of the whole population of the country. That was an intolerable position to take up, and one which it was impossible to defend. He thought the Catholics had been treated badly by the Government. They were promised a statement, and they ought to know what was the final word of the Government as to this question of grants to the contracted-out schools and forcing the Catholics out of the national system of education in England.

[Several Members on both sides of the House rose to continue the debate, and there were persistent cries from the OPPOSITION benches of "Runciman."]

MR. RUNCIMAN: Hon. Gentlemen opposite need be under no misapprehension. I have no objection to speaking. They must know that I am under the Rules of the House. I wanted, when replying, to cover the whole of the ground, and with Mr. Speaker in the Chair I can only speak once. In the first place, I want to refer to the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford. I think his strictures were a little undeserved. He blamed me for not having got up at once and made a full statement.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I complained that the statement, which was promised by the Prime Minister, was not given.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The statement that I can give now, I think, will be quite sufficient. The only Schedule that we have under discussion at the present time—we are not, in fact, discussing the terms of that Schedule, but the Resolution which covers it—is that which is now in the Bill; and I think I shall be able to show that in fixing this scale as we did we fixed it on liberal lines. It is not a stingy scale. I think it was the right hon. Gentleman opposite who said that those who managed the voluntary schools had not the information with regard to the cost of maintenance of those schools which is at the command of the Board of Education, but the right hon. Gentleman is really misinformed in that matter. The Board of Education have not got the opportunities or means of knowing or finding out any of the figures for individual schools, and the hon. Gentleman who preceded me in the last Administration at the Board of Education knows that that is the case. As a matter of fact we are really in the hands of the local authorities for much of the information that must be provided if we are to know in full everything that can be known about the maintenance of voluntary schools. I hope, therefore, that the Board of Education will not be blamed for not having fuller information at its command than the managers of those schools. Then most of the local authorities do not keep their accounts for these schools separately and they cannot give it to us, even if we had the right to ask for it from them. The hon and learned Member objected to our not having given him and his friends a full criticism of the whole of the information that has been given to us by the Roman Catholic authorities during the last two days. I will tell the hon. Gentleman why I have not been able to communicate with him earlier. A very large number indeed of the Roman Catholic forms were presented to us about two o'clock on Monday. Many only arrived at three o'clock yesterday, and since then I have had my officials hard at work examining those forms as carefully as they possibly could. No time has been lost, and up to a late hour last night and during the whole of to-day they have been occupied in examining not 140, as has been put forward, but well over 800 schools. That is no small task, and as far as I can give the House information, I am very glad to do so. The hon. and learned Gentleman also objected to a statement of mine that on behalf of the Roman Catholic communion there had been very wild figures used in exaggeration of the sum which might fall on them if they contracted-out. He referred in particular to the figure of £300,000 which I quoted the other day. When I referred to that figure I was quoting from a paper, which I believe is a Roman Catholic paper, called the *Tablet*, and I quoted that as an instance of the sort of exaggeration which many Members attempt in this House. The noble Lord opposite used very large figures, and I venture to criticise the figures that he put forward on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church. He did not say that this scale would throw a burden of £120,000 on the Roman Catholic Church; he said the figure would be £214,000.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT: I was speaking from the White Paper.

MR. RUNCIMAN: That just shows what an enormous discrepancy there is between the figures of the noble Lord and those which have been carefully compiled by those who represent the Roman Catholic Churches. I shall show both to him and to the Leader of the Opposition that the White Paper does not give, and does not purport to give, the cost of the maintenance of contracted-out schools. Now, if £214,000 upon examination by the Roman Catholic authorities is brought down to £120,000, I think we may take it that the smaller figure is nearer the mark than the larger. The Roman Catholic authorities, who were good enough to place this information at the disposal of the Board of Education, have given us, as far as they possibly could, the actual value. But they have in many cases given us the estimated amounts. So far as I have been able to ascertain from the summary which has been made from the balance-sheets and other figures which have been put before us at the Board of Education, we come approximately to the same result as the hon. and learned Gentleman. But I would point out to the hon. and learned Gentleman that in a very large number of instances the figures are estimated and are so stated in the Paper.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Some of the instances I gave, such as London, Liverpool, and other places, are not estimates, but actual figures checked by the local authorities.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I was going to say that in the case of London, Liverpool, and one or two other places the figures are the actual amounts, but that does not apply to the whole country. A very large number of them are estimated figures. My officials found, in scrutinising these figures, that approximately the total estimated expenditure by the Roman Catholic authorities in their schools will work out at about 58s. 8d. per scholar, and I would commend that to the attention of the right hon. Gentleman opposite who thought that the Archbishop's figure of 64s. was nearer the mark. These are the actual figures from the accounts of 800 Catholic schools. [AN HON. MEMBER: "There are a thousand of them."] There are about 1,000 of these schools, but those which have been left out of account are immaterial. These are made up of teachers' salaries, which work out at 49s. 11d. per scholar, a figure which does not differ materially from that of the right hon. Gentleman; and of 8s. 9d. per scholar for the other items which have been included in the forms under the head of maintenance. But some of these items are items which do not properly fall under the head of maintenance.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: What are the items which do not properly fall under the head of maintenance?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I will state that later. Therefore the total amount that the Roman Catholics believe will fall on them if this scale is adhered to is £120,000, or about 8s. 9d. per scholar. But some of these estimates are quite clearly very wide of the mark. In one case the estimate for cleaning, warming, and lighting would work out at £1 per scholar, which everyone with experience of schools knows must be very wide of the mark. In most cases it works out at only a few shillings at the outside. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Have you the average attendances?"] I am afraid I have not the average attendances, but I do not think it matters. In other schools the same item is estimated at about 15s. 7d. per scholar, at Nottingham St. Mary's 14s., at Saffron Hill about 11s., and at Ilkley about 10s. It is clear these figures must be a little wide of the mark, but I have no quarrel with the Roman Catholic authorities who have done their best to give us information. The figure for books, apparatus, and stationery at Leeds St. Anne's Higher Grade School is estimated at 15s. 3d. per scholar, and that is the largest figure I have ever heard suggested, and it is very wide of the mark; at Rugby St. Mary's the amount is very nearly 10s. Then there is lumped together for "other expenses," the interpretation of which we have no means of knowing, something like 12s. per scholar at St. Anne's Underwood School, and in another case 9s. 7d., and so on. Thus, a number of the items, in so far as they are estimates, are not good estimates. I do not wish to draw any inference from that except that I am sure that the Roman Catholic authorities have not underestimated the amount of money which they would have to bear. One of the items included for maintenance is repair of the structure. That is a capital charge, and, therefore, it ought not to be put into the account. In two or three cases there is a charge for interest—interest, I presume, on mortgage loans. That, again, is never treated as a maintenance charge. In another case religious inspection is treated as an ordinary charge of maintenance, and in another case there is added in an amount of 12s. per scholar for alterations. I know that the hon. and learned Gentleman would not wish to maintain that those amounts are items which would properly come under the heading of maintenance. And, therefore, with those few criticisms, which I venture to offer as an example of how estimates get out of hand, I would suggest that the Catholic figures are very generous figures from their point of view. I do not think they are as greatly exaggerated as the £240,000 of thenoble Lord opposite. They estimate that about 8s. 9d. per scholar would fall upon them under this scale if the child population in their schools did not diminish. But they must be quite aware of the fact that under the altered conditions—the building of new Council schools, and the fact that they have the power to put out of their schools those who are not of their own faith—there must in many instances be a diminution of their school population. I have specially framed the scale in the schedule of this Bill with that in view, and that would, I think, be of material assistance to them. The hon. and learned Gentleman stated that in London the amount per child worked out at about 69s. 8d. each and in Liverpool also at a very large sum. But under a pooling arrangement you cannot take one specific big town, you must take the country as a whole—the cheap schools with the dear schools, and make the money go as far as you can. The amount which the hon. and learned Gentleman says would fall upon them—8s. 9d. per child—may, I think, be diminished slightly because of the over-estimate—because we shall give a larger grant as the schools diminish in size, and for other reasons. In the year 1901 the amount which was produced by the Roman Catholic Church for their schools in this country, so far as we may gather from the published accounts, worked out at about 6s. 5d. per child, or, it may be, 6s. 6d. I do not think there is very much material difference between the estimated 8s. 9d. and the 6s. 5d. which is the actual figure which appears in the published statistics, and when the hon. Gentleman makes a demand that we should really support their schools as if they were still rate-aided, I really must tell him that we cannot do that. The hon. Member must know, and I am bound to say that we cannot make the grants to the contracting-out schools equivalent to what the grants plus the rates have been in the last six years. The hon. and learned Gentleman says then it will be of no use, for they will get no aid out of it. I doubt whether there is any denomination in the country better equipped for pooling arrangements than the Roman Catholic community. The hon. Member for Mayo quoted the Irish case, but I have no doubt the Irish case would be entirely different. If there had been no rate aid given to the denominational schools there would be no education controversy in progress at the present time. If the voluntary schools were still as they are in Ireland, and had not been placed upon the rates, we should not have this raging educational controversy now. So that we cannot copy the example of Ireland. Ireland, after all, is a country of small schools, and the fact that they are not so efficient as the schools in this country or in Scotland is due to the fact that they are such small schools. Scotland is much nearer our case than Ireland. The Catholic schools in Scotland are not inefficient, they are very good. In Scotland, where the standard of education is much higher than in Ireland, the cost is 67s. 10d. per child. In Scotland, the Roman Catholics have been able to educate their children well and secure good, efficient teachers, and they have received in the past only a 40s. grant from the Exchequer. Therefore, I do not think we are making any unreasonable demand upon the Roman Catholics in England to do what their co-religionists are doing in Scotland. Then the right hon. Gentleman complained that we had kept the House in the dark in regard to the

Schedule. We have not kept the House in the dark; it has been on the Table ever since the Bill was printed. The hon. Member must know that I cannot discuss the Schedule in full detail on this Motion, seeing that we have specially arranged the time so that we may have a full discussion of it when we come to it. The right hon. Gentleman quoted from the White Paper, and has made three exceptions, but he omitted four other items which cannot fall on the voluntary schools. Such items as cookery, handicrafts, drawing, etc., are all special expenses. He also mentioned the item for scholarships, an item which is growing rapidly.

MR. LYTTELTON: Are the contracted-out schools to do without these advantages?

MR. RUNCIMAN: No, Sir. We have specially put in a clause in order that the local authorities may throw open their special facilities.

MR. LYTTELTON: Yes, "may."

MR. RUNCIMAN: We cannot take the local authorities by the throat and compel them to do for the voluntary schools what they are not compelled to do for their own schools. I do not think the local authorities will be at all captious over these facilities, for they are all only too anxious to see the children in their own localities properly educated. Moreover, it cannot be suggested there is a religious difficulty either in the handicrafts or the cookery centres. Then the items for erection and alterations should come upon capital account.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that the contracted-out schools will never require alteration or enlargement?

MR. RUNCIMAN: No, but those are not maintenance, but capital charges. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman is not going to suggest that the State ought to bear the capital charges of the voluntary schools. The wear and tear charges are not likely to be heavy. I cannot understand whether the right hon. Gentleman wishes to throw the administrative charges of these schools and these associations on the rates, and it surely cannot be solemnly suggested that we should vote money for the salaries and administrative expenses of the National Society. That is quite unreasonable, and I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman cannot have looked very closely into that item. I have never heard of a claim of that kind being put forward by any other portion of the voluntary schools. The right hon. Gentleman proceeded to refer with a certain amount of brevity and reticence to a communication which passed to-day between the Archbishop of Canterbury and myself. In that letter the Archbishop of Canterbury relies upon the figures presented to him for 140 schools. These figures were presented to me not as a full statement of the case of the Church schools, as was done in the case of the Catholic schools, but as a sample of the case of the Church schools. [AN HON. MEMBER on the Opposition Benches: "The full case could not be presented in regard to so many schools."] If it were done on behalf of the Roman Catholics, why could it not be done also on behalf of the Church schools?

LORD R. CECIL: How could they do it for 11,500 schools?

MR. RUNCIMAN: This does not apply to 11,500 schools. There are only 5,200 of these contracting-out Church schools. But I make no complaint. I only say if you are going to take a dipping sample of about 3 per cent. of the schools, you are not able to make a full and accurate statement of the position of the Church schools. The Archbishop was good enough to ask some of his experts to confer with us at the Board of Education, and go into the accounts of these schools. I refer to the 140 schools. We should have been glad to reconsider our grant if the case for these schools were substantiated, but it was not substantiated. Let me point out some of the discrepancies which came out during the discussion of these estimates. The Returns produced were not those of the actual annual expenditure, but were the estimate of managers of individual schools which on the face of them, were quite unreliable.

In the very first sheet that I examined I found among the items of annual expenditure a sum of £275 for rent. Rent is properly a capital charge, not a maintenance charge.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): No.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to know something about these charges.

SIR HENRY CRAIK: It is a maintenance charge.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to proceed. It is a long time since the hon. Gentleman was at the Board of Education himself. I am giving the best possible information and giving it perfectly accurately. I say that rent is not recognised as a maintenance charge.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: No.

MR. RUNCIMAN: It is impossible to get on with a running fire like this. Does the hon. Gentleman suggest that we ought to pay the rent of the voluntary schools?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I do not for a moment. But in the White Paper rent is put down as a charge of maintenance in the estimate of the general cost of the up-keep of council schools; and if rent is regarded as an element of maintenance in the case of council schools, it should be regarded as an element of maintenance in the case of the contracting-out schools also.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The local authorities who have administered the Act of 1902 have never regarded rent as a maintenance charge. Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that every item which appears on the White Paper should be borne by the State? Of course not. I come now to the next item. It is said that when those schools in London which have been furnished by the London County Council contract-out, the County Council will withdraw the furniture and that they will have to be refurnished. Well, £300 for furniture was put down not for one year but as part of the annual expenditure of one of the schools. I am sure that no one will justify an item like that. There is an item for a football field. There is also a charge for school-attendance officers. They are paid for by the local authority. I found also a charge for medical inspection. That again is a charge which is borne not by the Church schools but by the local authority. I say it is impossible to accept estimates like these in support of a claim for larger grants from the Exchequer. They are not drawn up on a uniform basis; they contain optional as well as necessary expenditure; capital expenditure and maintenance expenditure; charges to be borne by the magistrates, charges to be borne by the local authorities; and the various items are so inextricably mixed up that it is impossible to accept the statement as a full and accurate presentation of the case of the Church schools

MR. LYTTELTON: I said I had no means of checking the returns in regard to those 140 schools. I mentioned that the Archbishop was so hurried that he could only get the figures in regard to these schools. What I ask the right hon. Gentleman to state now is what deduction from or addition to the 64s. 10d. per head he is prepared to make on the advice of his own experts?

MR. RUNCIMAN: When I have completed this part of my statement I shall be glad to answer the right hon. Gentleman. What I say is that estimates which are based on the accounts furnished by individual managers from all parts of the country, having no uniform principle running through them, are not sufficient to substantiate the case which has been put forward on behalf of the Archbishop. I do not blame the Archbishop, I do not blame the right hon. Gentleman. They relied on their experts, but I do think they have been badly advised, and I am quite sure that if their experts had dealt fairly with them they would not have made themselves responsible for statements such as those from which I have quoted this evening. The right hon. Gentleman relies on the White Paper. The right hon. Gentleman, if he had listened to the beginning of my speech, would know that we gave certain information from the local authorities—information that we had no right to demand and which some local authorities have refused to give—information in regard to some of the items. The item of 64s. 10d. is compared with 58s. 8d., but it is quite clear that the 64s. 10d. covers an entirely different set of items from those quoted by the right hon. Gentleman. You cannot add the cost of special subject classes scholarships, and there is no authority for knowing what the items cover. The right hon. Gentleman might throw up his hands, but where could we get the information? The local authorities decline to give it, and we cannot compel them to give it; they did not do it under his Bill; he had no statutory authority to require it. It is all very well to ask what is the use of the Board of Education; but the Board can only act on the authority it has under statute, and I think the right hon. Gentleman himself shared in the responsibility for the statute that set it up. I have given the basis on which we founded our calculation; there is nothing to conceal. We know the cost of the teaching staff, we have the power to find that out, and we have found it out. We know that the cost comes to £13,800,000, or an average of 52s. 3d. per child. It is high, and very largely because of the high salaries paid in London and the larger districts there is no cheap class of teachers. That is the amount, 52s. 3d. Now what other items fall on the cost of voluntary schools? There are fuel, lighting, cleaning, apparatus, books. Well, from all the information we can get under these heads I believe the cost works out at less than 8s. per child, that is to say, the total cost all over the country of Church schools that contract-out cannot exceed 60s. per child, and of Roman Catholic schools, 58s. 8d. Now what does that mean? The State actually under our contracting-out scheme provides five-sixths of the total up-keep of the schools, and we maintain that a sixth is not too large a proportion for the denomination to pay for the private management and private patronage they will enjoy. I might also say that on the other side we are giving a right of entry into county schools without charging a penny.

LORD R. CECIL: Our own schools.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I hope hon. Gentlemen will not put their claim too high. Is this proportion more than the Church of England can bear? Take the year 1901, the last year for which I have the figures, showing the amount of money coming from local sources towards Church schools. In that year the total grant amounted to, not 50s., but 35s. per child, and the amount coming from local resources to 10s. per child. We raised the grant subsequently to 47s., and then we raised it to 50s., so that with the grant we propose in this Bill we are making it possible for the Church schools to contract out without having to bear any greater burden than they had in 1901–2. The right hon. Gentleman may think we are cutting it rather fine, but that is not so, because that is on the assumption that every school will contract-out. The items do very nearly balance; but, as I was pointing out, there will be, under this Bill, a large number of Church schools which will be transferred. I am sure nobody will suggest for a moment that no Church schools will be transferred except in single-school districts. If that were so I should despair of any success coming to this Bill. If the Government had been under the impression that all the schools except in single-school areas were to contract-out we could not possibly have set our hands to this Bill. We have been told from the first by those who represent the Church of England that that Church looked forward to contracting-out being the exception and not the rule. If you are going to reduce that area, instead of having 5,200 schools outside, you will have 500 schools outside, and naturally the large sum of money which was at the disposal of the Church of England in 1901 would produce not 10s. per child but an enormously larger sum. If this Bill goes through, and the schools which are run now by the Church of England are to any considerable extent transferred, there is no reason why the Church of England schools should not be the most prosperous schools in England and Wales. It is quite possible that the subscriptions may have fallen in the interval, but they will have to cover a much smaller area than formerly, and I believe that those who hold so dearly to the principles of the Church of England are not likely to be less generous to the Church schools in 1909 than they were in 1901. One of the items which is missing from our Bill is a sliding scale for the future. I say quite frankly that we are prepared to put into the Schedule, if it is accepted in anything like a reasonable spirit, a Schedule which will provide that the contracted-out schools shall have a proportionate share in any increase above the grants under these proposals that may be made in Exchequer grants for the ordinary maintenance of public elementary schools. What I mean is this, we do not intend—and we would not like our successors—to give a larger Exchequer grant to local authority schools than to contracted-out schools, and if the Schedule does not provide for that elasticity we are prepared to revise it. I can only say that the Bill and Schedule actually fulfil what was undertaken by the Prime Minister. We have given a right—a real and effective right—of entry into the council schools, which many of our friends much dislike. We have also given those schools which think they must contract out a reasonable chance of existence. We have increased the amount of the grant by 3s. If we had adhered to the 47s. proposed by my hon. friend I am sure he could have made out a good case for that amount. But we have gone up by 3s. in order to meet hon. Gentlemen opposite and those who represent the Church. We believe that our offer, if it errs at all, errs on the side of liberality. With all the information at our disposal we are forced to the conclusion that to give a material or even a moderate increase would actually put a premium upon contracting out. I know it is not the intention of the Archbishop of Canterbury, nor do I believe it is the desire of any sound educationist in this country, definitely to encourage contracting out. I admit that, with all its drawbacks, it may be necessary as an exception; I do not think it necessary as a rule; and, indeed, if we were materially to increase the grant we should actually destroy the very basis upon which this Bill is founded.

*Mr. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) said that the President of the Board of Education had attempted to show a discrepancy between the figure of £120,000 a year quoted by the hon. Member for Waterford as the annual burden on Catholic schools and that of £215,000 quoted by the noble Lord the Member for Chichester. The two were perfectly reconcileable, the one being based on present expenditure while the other was an estimate of the future burden which the Bill would lay upon the schools. Now subsection (1) of Clause 3 laid it down that the contracted-out school must comply with all such conditions of efficiency, as regards teaching staff, school premises, and secular instruction as were required by the Board of Education in schools provided by the local education authority, and, therefore, the only basis on which they could argue this subject was the difference between the cost of maintenance in the provided schools and the amount of the grant offered them under the Bill. How were they to arrive at that difference? They could only start on the basis of the White Paper. He thought it a little hard that the President of the Board of Education should base his case on odd accounts sent up by private managers under great pressure, by singling out particular items where the accounts were badly made out, and that he should try to destroy their contentions on these figures when it was the business of the Government themselves to supply statistics on which alone the House could be expected to judge of the matter.

They must, however, go to the White Paper, and in reference to the figure of £215,000, that was based on the figure of the White Paper multiplied by the number of children in average attendance. He would like to take a smaller example for the sake of argument, and he would take the schools of the smallest religious community. In London there were some 6,700 children in average attendance in Jewish schools, and on the basis of the White Paper there would be a difference in round figures of 46s., which would appear to mean a charge on these schools of about £15,400 a year. What deductions were they to make from the White Paper? He invited the right hon. Gentleman to tell them tomorrow. In the case of these Jewish schools, a small number of schools all in the area of one local authority, these figures could be obtained as regarded London, and he thought that when they came to Clause 3 they ought to know what deductions were possible under the heads mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman from the figure of £15,400 which on the face of the White Paper would appear to be the sum which would have to be made up on the eight Jewish schools in London alone. To return to the figures of his own co-religionists, on the basis of the White Paper, the difference would come to £215,000. What deductions were they to make? He again invited the right hon. Gentleman to say. It could not be more than 4s. 10d. at the utmost, because under the right hon. Gentleman's own statement the 52s. plus the 8s. were chargeable in items which he himself admitted. He would make a very broad assumption for the sake of argument; he would say that these deductions might account for one-sixth of the difference. They thus got down to £179,000. Fees might have been charged in a very few schools before 1902, but he would make the assumption that £5,000 might possibly be raised in fees, and that got them down to £174,000. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that they would gain by the exclusion of scholars, which would get the schools on to a higher grant. They might gain infinitesimally per head, but they clearly would lose in the grant as a whole, and if economic laws held good with regard to the schools, the greater the bulk the cheaper the handling. Though they might, therefore, get a little more per child they would lose largely on the whole. With regard to pooling, he would not go into that, because it would in any case only be a slight shifting of the burden. Making every possible deduction, he put the future cost of these schools alone, on the present assured basis of expenditure, at £160,000 a year, exclusive of loan and administration charges. But, of course, there would be additions. In the first place, this 64s. 10d. was only an average, and in the second place the average varied, *i.e.*, the 64s. 10d. was itself depressed by the fact that it included expenditure on voluntary schools, which had not come up to its natural level, because the increments of the teachers were only slowly, year by year, being earned. In London, the general expenditure was 94s. per child on the whole, but it was 99s. in the provided schools alone. Therefore, when the voluntary school teachers who were placed in the scale rose to their maximum the average would be 99s., instead of 94s., and the same thing was true of other towns. There must also be a large increase on administration. The handling of this very large though insufficient sum of money would require a large secretarial staff, and there would have to be auditors and branch officers in the provinces, and considerable travelling expenses. The administration charges generally were 3s. 5d. per child, but if he put them as low as 1s. per child that, in the case of these schools, would amount to £14,000 a year alone. They started with a minimum under the Bill of £160,000 certain, which must be increased by the items to which he had referred, and taking the possible deduction and setting against them the certain additions, he could not make out that the expenditure of these schools could be less than £190,000 a year, and shortly might be £210,000. How could a difference like that conceivably be met? How were they to deal with that situation? Were they to refuse the increments already promised to their teachers, or were they to dismiss them? What was said about the right hon. Gentleman about elasticity was meaningless. It did not provide against an increase in rate charges. All he said was that if an increased grant were to be made from the Exchequer some proportion would go to these schools in the future, but that did not meet the point that with a limited grant the schools which contracted out would be condemned to an ever-growing and uncertain expenditure. It put them in the cruel dilemma that they were necessarily made to look with suspicion on all educational progress that was costly. If this scheme of contracting out was carried through, there would be many loyal subjects up and down the country who would feel a sense of the gravest hardship and intolerable wrong.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that as he listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman he continually asked himself—Is this a settlement? His whole tone was one of vehement and almost angry criticism of the figures submitted——

MR. RUNCIMAN: I did nothing of the kind. I was trying to give the House as full information as possible.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he would withdraw the word angry, but he was surprised as he reminded himself that he was listening to a discussion on a settlement that he himself had honestly endeavoured to work in favour of, and in which the right hon. Gentleman had borne an honourable part, because the whole tone of the right hon. Gentleman was extremely critical of figures submitted to him under great difficulty by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his advisers. What was the situation? The right hon. Gentleman had been negotiating for this settlement for months. The essence of the transaction, as in most of these transactions, after all was the money consideration in the case of the schools which would not come in to the general system. It was proposed that the denominations should surrender their schools to the control of the local authority, that they should receive in return a right of entry which they had been discussing more or less imperfectly for a day and a half, and that certain schools where the children were of one faith, and which could not come conscientiously under this system, should be allowed to contract out on terms which it was hoped would keep them not below the educational level of the rest of the community. On what grounds did he complain that the Archbishop's figures were ineffective and unconvincing? He was not sure that they were, but what was the position? The Roman Catholic denomination had 800 schools to deal with; the Church of England had more than 11,000.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Only 5,200 Church schools can contract out.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the whole cost of maintaining a voluntary school was surely an element of the calculation, and there were 11,000 voluntary schools in the country. In the estimate of the cost of maintaining a school all the schools were taken into consideration, and the schools which could not contract out were brought into the calculation. Under these circumstances it was not fair to say there were only 5,000 which would contract out when they used the other schools to lower the standard cost of maintenance. The right hon. Gentleman kept on alluding to one item after another and asking whether the Government was expected to pay this or that, as if the items submitted by the advisers of the Archbishop were items in a bill. They were nothing of the sort. They were estimates of the expenditure which would fall on a contracted-out school, and they could not keep up to the educational level of the rest of the community without a larger demand than the Schedule allowed upon the Parliamentary grant. After all, what figures had they to go upon? The right hon. Gentleman produced a certain number of figures which he said had been submitted to him, and considered by his experts, and which he believed to overthrow the calculations of the Archbishop; but what had they had to go upon except his own White Paper? What were the shadowy calculations which he said had been submitted to him, and which had been produced under great pressure during the last two or three days, compared with the elaborate and considered estimate in the White Paper? It was very difficult to upset those figures. They showed the steady march of education. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman was familiar with the Report of the Departmental Committee which sat in 1906. The estimates for the cost of maintenance in London, in county boroughs and urban districts, were there given, and the White Paper showed a small, but very legitimate advance made on the cost of education for every one of those areas. Therefore, they might take it that the statistics of the White Paper were absolutely reliable, because the figures very nearly corresponded, just differing sufficiently to show the ever increasing cost of education in the country. Therefore, he entirely declined, and he thought those who were advising the Archbishop in these negotiations were entitled to decline, to consider figures for which they had no authority whatever, except the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that they had been considered in the course of the last few days at the Board of Education, as against the authoritative document which was before the House. The White Paper made out a charge of 64s. 10d. a child. The right hon. Gentleman said that a great deal of the cost would not fall upon the contracted-out schools. He really doubted whether he was justified in striking out classes for special subjects. There was a Parliamentary grant for the special subjects, and he presumed that the contracted-out schools would enjoy it, but he took it that the grant did not cover the whole cost, and that the local authority would make a charge upon the contracted-out school for the use of these classes corresponding to the expenditure out of the rates. Then with regard to scholarships. He did not understand also why contracting-out schools should not offer the same advantages to students in respect of scholarships as the local authorities' schools, nor why they should not estimate in their expenditure the scholarships that would be offered. The right hon. Gentleman had held up to ridicule the purchase of land, erection and enlargement, alteration and maintenance, of school buildings. If that was a fair charge to put down as an item in the maintenance of a council school, why was it to be unfair in the contracting-out schools? The contracted-out school would need to keep up its buildings, and from time to time to enlarge them just as much as the council schools, and those who had to bear the cost of the upkeep would also have to pay the rate which went towards the upkeep of the other schools in the county. Upkeep was an item which could not be left out of consideration nor could the cost of administration. It might very well be that the contracted-out schools would require officers to see to school attendance. If so, it was an item of cost in considering the financial position of the contracted-out schools. And when they came to the cost of administration the right hon. Gentleman forgot that he had put upon the Church of England the administration of, possibly, a couple of millions of money, which would have to be dealt with by apportionment to the contracted-out schools. Pooling, no doubt, did help where there was a great discrepancy in the case of one area as against another which was maintained at less cost, and which could help the one which was maintained at a greater cost. But he was afraid the contracted-out schools would always be found to be in areas of the same financial capacity, and that pooling would not be such an assistance as the right hon. Gentleman supposed. But, anyhow, the administration of this larger fund must be a considerable item of cost. That being so, they had the right hon. Gentleman's figures before them, which he would take as authoritative figures set forth in the White Paper, and they were not satisfied that the deductions which he proposed to make were justifiable. What was the upshot of the whole matter? How did they stand? The finance of the contracted-out school was really the essence of the transaction. The Roman Catholic schools had stated their own case. He was not prepared to be bound by the financial statement of the Roman Catholics. They might have their views as to the cost of maintenance and their own economy, which might not be that of other schools. At any rate, on the right hon. Gentleman's figures, it seemed to him that the Archbishop's contention that the grant must be increased by a sum of at least 6s. to make the financial position tolerable for the contracting-out schools was a minimum statement. He hoped that the financial question might be settled satisfactorily, but if it was not, he did not think that the fault would rest with the Opposition. The whole power of ascertaining the financial position of any school in the kingdom rested with the right hon. Gentleman. Under the Code he could get the figures of any school which he chose to ask for. He had had this matter before him for months. He had published a Paper, the figures of which they were prepared to accept. He disputed his own figures, and he disputed the Archbishop's figures, and under these circumstances he (Sir William Anson) was rather puzzled to know where they were, or what figures would satisfy the right hon. Gentleman as to the financial position of contracted-out schools. If he was a friend of the settlement he was no friend of contracting-out. If contracting-out, on the scale put forth in the Bill, was the last word of the Government, he should feel it his duty to oppose the Bill. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman might yet find it possible to enable him to support him, as he had hitherto done, in effecting a settlement which he believed he had at heart, but if his speech to-night was the last word on the subject his hopes were sinking very low.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 244; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 430.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banner, John S. Harmood
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grins'd.
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.)
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fletcher, J. S.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S.Edm.)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc's)
Harmsworth,R. L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.)
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, Sir George
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Laren,Rt.Hn.SirC.B.(Leices.
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt. Hn.A.C.(Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncst'r')
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson,W. H. M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan

Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Rt. Hn. H. L. (Cleveland
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashtonunder Lyne)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E)
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clynes, J. R.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gham)
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Dillon, John
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gardner, Ernest
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.)
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nineteen minutes before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1908.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition for Amendment of; of school board of Kirkcaldy; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

STATISTICS (FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Statistical abstract for the principal and other foreign countries in each year from 1896 to 1905–1906 (as far as the particulars can be stated), with some provisional figures for 1907. Thirty-fourth Number.

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Return in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of railway servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of July, 1908, on duty on certain railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time, or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours, were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours rest; showing periods of duty after deduction of time (if any) spent in travelling home after relief and certain definite and continuous intervals of rest of four hours or upwards; with appendices giving additional statements and explanations furnished by the railway companies.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Order No. 7619, dated 28th November, 1908, permitting the landing at a foreign animals wharf in Great Britain of animals carried on board the s.s. "Titian."

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS ACTS, 1877 AND 1907.

Order, dated the 27th November, 1908, entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Wisbech and District) Order of 1908."

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LAW OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order).

Lord ATKINSON explained that the Amendments standing in his name on the Paper were really Lord Halsbury's Amendments, which he had undertaken to move on his noble and learned friend's behalf. He first moved to omit from paragraph (*c*) of Clause 1 the words "lease, under-lease, or." The paragraph would then read—

> "Any other person whatsoever not being a tenant of the premises or of any part thereof, and not having any beneficial interest in any any tenancy of the premises or of any part thereof."

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 15, to leave out the words 'lease, under-lease, or.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

Lord COURTNEY of PENWITH accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 3 agreed to.

Lord ATKINSON formally moved to omit from Clause 4 the provision that the Bill should not apply to goods of an under tenant (not being a lodger) who should have become a tenant of premises without the consent of the superior landlord contrary to any lease or agreement under which the immediate tenant held.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 3, line 32, to leave out from the word 'Corporation' to the word 'Provided' in line 37."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord ATKINSON moved three Amendments to the proviso at the end of Clause 4, so as to make it read—

> "Provided that it shall be competent for a stipendiary magistrate, or where there is no stipendiary magistrates for two justices, upon application by the superior landlord or any under tenant or other such person as aforesaid, upon hearing the parties, to determine whether any goods are in fact goods covered by subsection (2) of this section."

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, lines 40 and 41, to leave out the words, "the under tenant or other persons not being the immediate tenant of."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 41, after the word "landlord" to insert the words "or any under tenant or other such person as aforesaid."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 2, to leave out the word "premises" and to insert the word "goods," and after the word "by," to insert the word "subsection."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 5, agreed to.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH, who had an Amendment on the Paper to leave out Clause 5, which ran—

"This Act shall not apply to any under tenant, not being a lodger, where the under tenancy has been created in breach of any covenant or agreement in writing between the landlord and his immediate tenant, or where the under tenancy has been created contrary to the wish of the landlord in that behalf, expressed in writing and delivered at the premises within a reasonable time after the circumstances have come, or with due diligence, would have come to his knowledge,"

said that words had just been deleted from Clause 4, on the Motion of Lord Atkinson, to the omission of which he (Lord Courtney) ought to have objected; but he was under the impression that what the noble and learned Lord was moving was merely a drafting Amendment. He certainly thought his attention might have been called to the effect of the Amendment. As the words in question had been omitted from Clause 4, he had no option but to allow Clause 5 to stand. He would not, therefore, move his Amendment.

LORD AVEBURY said the words that have been struck out of Clause 4 were suggested by him in Committee, and were, he understood, assented to by the noble Lord in charge of the Bill. Lord Halsbury suggested other words which he thought would better carry out the object, and Clause 5 was the result. As Clause 5 was in the Bill he (Lord Avebury) did not object to the words in Clause 4 being deleted, and now that those words had disappeared Clause 5 was necessary.

LORD ATKINSON said his reason for moving the omission of the words in question from Clause 4 was that Clause 5 covered exactly the same point. He did not understand that the noble Lord in charge of the Bill preferred retaining the provision in Clause 4. Moreover, Lord Halsbury, for whom he was acting, attached the utmost importance to Clause 5, which contained more than was provided for by the words omitted from Clause 4.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH said it was precisely these additional words in Clause 5 to which he objected.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR having called attention to the fact that there was no Amendment before the House,

The discussion on Clause 5 dropped.

LORD ATKINSON moved to amend Clause 6 so as to compel the under-tenant, if served with the required notice, to pay to the superior landlord not only the rent due but also the rent accruing.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 18, after the word 'rent' to insert the words 'whether the same has already accrued due or not.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH accepted the Amendment.

On Question Amendment agreed to.

LORD ATKINSON said the Amendment standing in his name to Clause 8 was really, if their Lordships would forgive an Irishism, consequential upon an Amendment which had not yet been reached. Clause 10 provided that the Act should not apply to Scotland, and when that clause was reached he proposed to add words restricting the application of the Bill in Ireland to a rent issuing out of lands or tenements situate wholly within the boundaries of a municipality or of a township having town commissioners. The object was to remove agricultural tenancies from the operation of the Act. The noble Lord in charge of the Bill was prepared to accept those additional words when they came to Clause 10, and therefore he now moved to insert in Clause 8, which provided that the Lodgers' Goods Protection Act, 1871, should be repealed as from the commencement of this Act, the words "wherever and so far as this Act applies."

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 25, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'wherever and so far as this Act applies.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment to Clause 9 agreed to.

LORD ATKINSON then moved to add to Clause 10 the provision to which he had referred, the practical effect of which, he said, would be to confine the Act to urban areas.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 32, after the word 'Scotland' to insert the words 'and shall only apply in Ireland to a rent issuing out of lands or tenements situate wholly within the boundaries of a municipality or of a township having town commissioners.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next, and to be printed as amended. (No. 237.)

INCEST BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

THE STRENGTH OF THE ARMY.

*THE EARL OF ERROLL: My Lords, I rise to call attention to a statement reported to have been made by the Secretary of State for War on Friday the 20th November, at Guildford, to the effect that, "the Army is 90,000 stronger than it was three years ago," and to ask for details justifying these figures; and to move for Papers.

What I want to know is whether these extra men—and I lay emphasis on the word extra—represent a net increase of the numbers of the Army, or do they merely represent a change of name and a re-arrangement of units, with the view of persuading the public that the armed strength of the country is greater than the facts justify? Do these men really exist in the flesh, or are they more in the nature of a stage Army, in which the same men are counted several times over? The right hon. Gentleman went on, in the speech to which I have alluded, to claim an increase of 65,000 men in the Special Reserve, and an increase of 40,000 in the reserve of the Regular Army. From this total of 105,000 men he deducted 15,000 as due to the reductions of nine battalions, leaving as the net increase 90,000 men. I venture to say that this calculation is erroneous and absolutely misleading, because it altogether ignores the Militia of three years ago. I maintain that in a comparative statement, if credit is taken for the Special Reserve now, credit should also be taken for the Militia as they existed in 1905. This is a debit and credit amount, and if you take credit for the Special Reserve you must take credit for the Militia as well. You must take credit for both or neither.

Now, what is the Special Reserve? It is merely the old Militia under a new name, with the obligation to serve abroad. At the present moment it is 25,000 men short of what the Militia was in 1905, and it has an annual training of fourteen days instead of twenty-eight days as in the case of the old Militia. In what I may call the pre-territorial days, it was the established custom when calculating the armed strength of the country to include the Militia, and I am informed that the War Office used always to rely on two-thirds of the Militia volunteering for service abroad. Granted that this obligation of the Special Reserve to serve abroad is a good one, which I am quite ready to admit, I maintain that that is no reason why all the value of the Militia of three years ago should be ignored. The Militia never failed to come forward when asked. They fought in very large numbers in the Peninsula, they were present in force at Waterloo, and during the Crimea they occupied the garrisons in the Mediterranean, and their services in South Africa are so recent that I need not allude to them.

The Militia establishment in 1905 was 130,000 men and their actual strength, irrespective of the permanent staff, was 90,000. The Special Reserve establishment is 80,000—its present strength is, I believe, somewhere near 65,000—so that, even if it were up to its total establishment, it would still be 10,000 below the Militia of three years ago. Even supposing that the organisation is better, I maintain that you cannot, by wiping out 90,000 men and replacing them by 65,000, claim to have increased the numbers. Really we are in a worse position now than we were three years ago. With 75,000 fewer men in the Territorial Army than we had in the Yeomanry and Volunteer Forces, 20,000 less men in the Regular services, and the balance of loss of 25,000 between the Militia and the Special Reserve, there are, deducting the increase in the Reserve of the Regular Army, 80,000 less men to call upon than there were three years ago.

Speaking in the City the other night, Mr. Haldane is reported to have said—

> "There was no greater fallacy than to suppose that the Government had reduced the Regular Line. They had far more than compensated for any changes by providing the Special Reserve."

To me this is a most astounding statement. It was the Militia who were replaced by the Special Reserve. The Regulars who have been done away with have never been replaced at all.

A word as to the organisation of the Special Reserve. It consists of so-called units of 550 men, with an annual training of fourteen days; it is to feed the Line, and is composed of very young men. I am told that not 50 per cent. of the men, after feeding the Line, would be fit, through age and physical defects, to take part in a campaign. Further, it would be impossible now for the Special Reserve to garrison Mediterranean and other ports and so free the Regular battalions there. The Special Reserve will have to remain at home as a depot, to train men to fill up the Army in the field. Than I come to the Expeditionary Force. It is claimed that the Expeditionary Force, which should be ready to go out of the country almost at once, consists of 160,000 men, and that the Army Reserve is now 140,000. I think this would convey to the non-military mind that we had 160,000 men *plus* 140,000 men. But it is nothing of the sort. Before mobilising this Expeditionary Force all these Reserves would be swallowed up. I am informed that two Divisions, or the equivalent of 30,000 men, would be sent to India. We should then want 100,000 to fill the ranks—that is, two reserve men to every man serving. For the Expeditionary Force the numbers are 169,000. The regiments that we have at home would, I believe, supply—that is to say, they have in their ranks now—120,000 men; but when you deduct the recruits, the unfit, and those under age you get a number something like 50,000. That leaves us in this country with only about 70,000 towards the Expeditionary Force and we should have to take 100,000 men from the Reserve to make up the Expeditionary Force. I believe the Army Council calculate that to replace casualties during the first six months we should want another 60,000 men, so that by that time we should have used up not only our Regular Army Reserve, but what is left of the Special Reserve as well.

Then I come to the Army Reserve of 140,000 men. I am quite willing to admit that that is an advance on what we have had, but those figures at the present moment are abnormal. They are not due to the Government scheme, but to temporary causes, and particularly due to the three years system established by Lord Midleton, but when these men begin to leave the Reserve, the numbers must go down, because their places will not be filled up, as their Reserve producing units have been destroyed, and I think that the normal Reserve will not be much over 100,000 or 110,000 men. Before the war we had an Army Reserve of 80,000, and a Militia Reserve of 30,000 men, so that when the present exceptional circumstances cease to prevail, the Reserve will come to be about what it was before the war. It is, therefore, absurd to say that the Army has not been reduced. From what I can see the exact contrary is the case. You cannot increase your numbers by simply changing a name. By improved organisation and an alteration in the terms of service you may increase efficiency, but that fact does not give you more men. Whether the men are called the First or Second Line does not affect the total numbers available. In my view, such statements as the one to which I have referred are dangerous and give to the country a false idea of our military strength.

Moved, that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to a statement reported to have been made by the Secretary of State for War on Friday the 20th November, at Guildford, to the effect "that the Army was 90,000 stronger than it was three years ago."—(*The Earl of Erroll.*)

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord LUCAS): My Lords, the speech of the Secretary of State for War at Guildford, to which the noble Lord has referred, was very inadequately reported in *The Times.* If the noble Earl had referred to fuller reports, he would have seen that Mr. Haldane was speaking entirely about the Regular Army. The noble Earl based his argument on what he has himself described as the condition of the armed forces. The position with regard to the Regular Army is exactly as stated by the Secretary of State. If you count, as you are bound to do, the numbers available on mobilisation and the Reserve, you will find that there is a large increase.

The increase has been obtained in this way. In the first place, we do not wish to take any credit to ourselves for the abnormal condition of the Regular Reserve. Its condition is entirely due to the action of the noble Viscount opposite (Lord Midleton). The three years system which the noble Viscount established, and the number of men who came in as three years men have increased the Reserve very much above the normal figure. It is 40,000 higher than in 1905, and about 14,000 or 15,000 higher than it will be when it gets back to what I may call its normal condition—that is to say, when the present terms of enlistment have been worked sufficiently long for the three years men to have all passed out of the Reserve. I do not wish to deny that it has been of great advantage to have had these 40,000 men. They have given a strength to the force which came in very opportunely to help us through the period of organisation. As gradually the new system comes into full operation the Special Reserve will, we hope, be up to its full establishment, the number of men serving with the Colours will be older and larger, and therefore we shall have to make much less call on the Reserve on mobilisation than we should have to do at present.

Next you have to consider the other category of Reserve—the Special Reserve. After passing the Act of last year you cannot help yourselves from considering the Special Reserve as a part of the First Line. It is true, as the noble Earl has said, that the Militia have always come forward very patriotically on the occasions when they have been called upon, and they have gone out in their units to the various big wars in which this country has been engaged. At the time of the South African War there was a Militia Reserve of 30,000 men, and without that Reserve it is hard to say what would have been done to find the necessary reinforcements for the Regular Army. But soon after the war the Militia Reserve, as the noble Earl will remember, was abolished, and some means had to be found to obtain drafts for the units of the First Line of the Regular Army outside the Army itself. The only way to obtain these was from the Militia, but the Militia, as we all know, were unwilling to undertake that function, and it was only after considerable difficulty that they did undertake it, and they have now come into the Special Reserve. Had you not had that re organisation, had you left things as they were when the present Government came into office, you would have had practically nothing to fall back upon for the supply of drafts and to fill up wastage of war in the Regular Army. You have provided that by the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, and I cannot conceive how it can be argued that those forces are not to be regarded as strengthening to that degree the Regular Army. I maintain that they are an important source of strength to the Regular Army.

When you talk about a profit and loss account you are again arguing from the point of view of the general armed forces of the Crown. Mr. Haldane carefully stated in his speech that he was only dealing with the Regular Army. It is quite true that the forces outside the Regular Army are proportionately less. What we claim is that by reorganisation and by more carefully and scientifically defining the functions of the various parts of the Regular Army it is possible to make it a more powerful and more efficient weapon with which to fulfil its duties. You still have the Militia in the present Special Reserve. You do not require more than a certain number of them on mobilisation; but on mobilisation you at once embody your Special Reserve units, and put into them not only the whole of the Special Reserve but also the surplus Regulars. There will be a certain number of surplus Reservists and a certain number of soldiers who for various reasons, being too young and so on, do not go abroad in case of war. They are formed into battalions. At present, if you had to mobilise the Army you would have seventy-four of these battalions, with a large proportion of Regular officers, who would be as capable of fulfilling duties for the defence of this country as the Militia would have been. They are not, of course, mobile troops, but you can usefully use them to release mobile troops for other purposes.

Then as regards the question of garrisoning stations in the Mediterranean and elsewhere to release Regular battalions. Besides the seventy-four battalions to which I have referred, who constitute the training machinery of your drafts, you have twenty-seven other battalions who will be used for that sort of purpose—for the same work, in fact, as the Militia did before. You are not going to call upon them to supply drafts; they are outside your drafting machinery. They are the fourth battalions, and will be used in the way I have suggested. At the early stage of the campaign, therefore, and before the Territorial Army has received its war training, you have these battalions of the Special Reserve who are more efficient from the military point of view than the old Militia, and are able to fulfil the duties that the Militia could have carried out.

*THE EARL OF ERROLL: Did I understand the noble Lord to say that the Special Reserve units were fit to take the place of the Militia in garrisoning stations in the Mediterranean and elsewhere?

*LORD LUCAS: Yes. You have seventy-four third battalions, who constitute the actual machinery for training drafts. Besides those, you have twenty-seven fourth battalions, which are not to provide drafts, but are to be used for garrisoning the stations in the Mediterranean and for similar purposes. As to the 90,000, there is an increase of 40,000 men of the Regular Reserve, and 65,000—now nearer 68,000—of the Special Reserve, and against that, you have to put the reductions made in the Regular Army of 18,000 men. The reductions in the Regular Army consist partly of those troops considered to be no longer required owing to certain changes in defensive policy.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Will the noble Lord state the nature of those troops?

*LORD LUCAS: The chief reductions are set out in the Return recently presented to your Lordship's House. The reductions consist chiefly of garrison artillery, which has been reduced by some 5,000 since 1905, and there is a reduction also in fortress engineers. By the reductions of these men the expeditionary force is not affected in any way. The reduction of certain infantry battalions has only taken place because they were surplus to any force you could possibly have organised and put into the field as an organised body. In spite of the reductions, we can at the present time mobilise a larger organised expeditionary force than was ever possible before, and now that the establishment is rapidly filling up, especially in the weak arms, we shall be able to mobilise an expeditionary force of over 160,000. There is at present, as I have said, an increase of 40,000 in the Regular Reserve and 68,000 in the Special Reserve, and if you allow 18,000 for reductions that brings the total increase to 90,000. As to the question of age, the number of men under twenty in the Special Reserve on October 1st was just over 16,000, which compares very favourably with the number under twenty in the Militia in 1905—the number was then 23,000.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, as we recently had a debate on the whole subject of our military strength I shall confine myself on the present occasion entirely to the point raised by the noble Earl, which is whether the Secretary of State for War is justified in going about the country stating that the Regular Army is now 90,000 stronger than it was two or three years ago. I submit that the argument which the noble Earl employed has not been answered in the smallest degree by the reply we have just had from the Under-Secretary. The noble Lord introduced a number of qualifications which, if they were all reported and were carefully weighed, would tend to remove from the minds of men a large percentage — perhaps 95 per cent.—of the value of the statement made by the Secretary of State. I would point out the extreme danger of such statements being made without those qualifications. I have in my hand a verbatim report of the speech of the Secretary of State, and this is the sort of statement I find in it—

> "I have to state that, so far from the Regular Army having been cut down, we are to-day 90,000 stronger than we were three years ago; and yet the Army costs two and a half millions less."

I believe the first statement is a delusion, and the second I hold to be absolutely incorrect. I challenge the noble Lord the Under-Secretary to substantiate it in a single particular.

*LORD LUCAS: If the noble Viscount will add the amount formerly spent annually in connection with military works loans, he will find the reduction in cost nearly twice as great.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Of course, if you give up a barrack programme and do not build the barracks necessary properly to house the troops you reduce expenditure, but it cannot properly be taken as a reduction on the cost of the Army. I speak with some indignation on this subject, because it is far too serious a one to be treated simply as a bone of contention across the floor of the House. The Secretary of State should have told his audience that a large part of the force to which he was referring was temporary and disappearing, owing to a long service system having been adopted as opposed to the short service system partially adopted by Lord Lansdowne, very much extended by his successor, and for which Mr. Arnold Forster intended to substitute a still shorter term which would have given an even larger Reserve. Mr. Haldane declared that it was a fallacy to suppose that an Army consisted only of people with the Colours, and he went on to compare our Reserve and this increase of strength with the Army of Germany. But the German Reserve is a Regular Reserve. What Mr. Haldane is asking the people of this country to believe is that the Reserve on which he is going to depend is also a Regular Reserve, whereas it is only a Reserve consisting of the old Militia under another name.

There is another point. The Secretary of State went on to justify himself for having reduced certain battalions. He said—

> "We got rid of units which could be of no service. We considered what made for fighting efficiency. We found a very large surplus of infantry, and we reduced them in proper proportion to other arms."

Units which could be of no service! He was referring to five battalions of Regular Infantry and one of Guards. Those battalions were raised under the last Administration. We had authority for it in the repeated demands of the Duke of Cambridge, of Lord Wolseley, of Lord Roberts, of Sir Redvers Buller, of Sir Evelyn Wood, and all the officers who served with them. Will the noble Lord tell me that any officer will declare that these battalions were surplus to our fighting efficiency?

LORD LUCAS: I can certainly say that, for the purpose of general military usefulness, the replacing of those infantry battalions by what is infinitely more required—artillery, of which the Army was ridiculously short—is of the utmost value.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: The noble Lord said that these battalions were surplus to any force we could possibly put into the field. Will any one of his military advisers at the War Office tell him that when the expeditionary force had been sent abroad and we were mobilising for home defence, these infantry battalions would be surplus to our requirements?

LORD LUCAS: As an organised force, certainly. There is no organisation into which we could fit them. They are outside any possible organisation.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Therefore, if a foreign force lands to-morrow—and it is admitted that that is not without the bounds of possibility—the

War Office, according to the Under-Secretary, prefer to meet the invading force with a Territorial Army and without the support of these five battalions of Regulars and this battalion of Guards. The noble Lord had better not advance such an argument, because it is impossible to maintain it, and the experience of all soldiers is against it. I have made these few remarks simply because I feel that the utterances of the Secretary of State are calculated to mislead the public. If they are not so intended, they ought to be withdrawn or modified. The effect of them can only be to pile up against the Secretary of State in the future the whole military opinion of all those who are now complaining of the undue reduction of our Regular Army. Even when the Secretary of State has got his Special Reserve to the full he will have a force which his soldiers will turn round and tell him they cannot depend on without more Regulars. I will add this assertion, that, even if the Secretary of State's statement is accepted as correct, he has not got the officers for the 90,000 men, and could not mobilise them to-morrow. What I would urge is that we might be allowed in future to gain the advantage on our side that we have endeavoured to give to the noble Lord. Not a word has fallen from this bench in criticism of the present condition of the Territorial Army, although we know its organisation is far from complete, because we believe that time should be given for the experiment and because we desire that everybody should lend a hand to make the experiment a success. But, in the meantime, I would urge that what I venture to call these vain-glorious boasts as to the condition of the Army, boasts which we know to have no military support whatever at their back, should be discontinued, and that the modifications which the Under-Secretary has to-night introduced into Mr. Haldane's speech should, on the first available opportunity, be made equally clear with the utterance of the Secretary of State of which we complain.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I do not propose to enter into the technical part of this debate, the War Office reply having already been given by my noble friend behind me. I merely desire to make one or two observations upon what was said by the noble Viscount who has just sat down. The noble Viscount took credit to himself and his friends on the benches opposite that they had not in any way attacked the organisation of the Territorial Army. With all respect to the noble Viscount that really is not the case. The debate which was initiated the other night by the noble and gallant Field-Marshal who is not now in his place, though not an attack on the Territorial Army, amounted to a categorical statement that the whole scheme of the Territorial Army was absolutely ineffective for the purpose for which it was designed and a demand for the establishment of an entirely different system; and noble Lords opposite trooped into the lobby with the noble and gallant Field-Marshal. To say after that that no attack has been made on the organisation of the Territorial Army because noble Lords have not mentioned what has happened in this county or that is not, it appears to me, entirely in accordance with the facts. After that debate we are, unfortunately, obliged to regard noble Lords opposite as wedded to some new, and, I confess, unexplained system of organisation of the forces of this country, and it was in the hope that we might avoid that conclusion that we besought noble Lords not to join the noble and gallant Field-Marshal in the lobby on that occasion. The noble Viscount objected to the inclusion of interest on loans in calculating the annual expenses of the Army because, he said, those loans were for all time. But, unfortunately, that is not so. The complaint was that a very large proportion of the money raised in that way was used for purposes not merely temporary, but which the experience of a few years showed to be useless. Therefore, I am afraid that from the taxpayers' point of view—and that is the only point of view which, when you come to speak of expenditure, matters—the money spent by way of loan must be counted in as much as the ordinary expenses of the Army.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: The noble Earl, I think, is ignoring the fact that all money raised on loan is being paid off by an annual charge over a short period of years. They are already bearing on their Estimates the cost of all loans of the last twenty years, many of which are reaching maturity.

THE EARL OF CREWE: We are, unfortunately for ourselves, suffering for the loans raised by the Government of noble Lords opposite. We are still paying for things that have proved, in more than one case, to be useless for the purpose for which they were designed. All the previous speakers pointed, with perfect truth, to the fact that a very considerable portion of the surplus of men to which my right hon. friend alluded is due to the exceptional swelling of the Reserve owing to the initiation and the abandonment of the three years service of the noble Viscount. I really think that, if I were the noble Viscount, I would talk as little as possible about the three years system, because I suppose it is common knowledge that that system had to be abandoned in a great hurry owing to the discovery being made that if it had been continued we should very soon have been without an Army or Reserve at all. We have no complaint whatever to make of this debate having been raised. I think it is a perfectly arguable point to say that my right hon. friend overstated his case, if noble Lords will have it so, in including the Special Reserve in the Army; but my right hon. friend does take up that position. He does differentiate between the position of that portion of the Militia which has been replaced by the Special Reserve and the Special Reserve itself, and there are perfectly sound reasons for doing so. It is, no doubt, the fact, as the noble Viscount stated, that the training in that case is not to the same extent as the Regular Army, but you must regard the Special Reserve now as forming part of the Regular Army, and I think my right hon. friend was quite justified in including it in his figures.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I am afraid we shall find ourselves wandering away from the point into a somewhat general discussion upon a number of interesting military questions. For example, I do not think the question of the policy of providing barracks by means of loans of greater or less duration is quite before us this evening. Nor, again, are we much concerned to-night with the Motion which was brought on the other evening by the noble and gallant Field-Marshal. I think by the way the noble Earl did Lord Roberts rather an injustice in representing him as having attacked the Territorial system. Lord Roberts, whenever I have had the pleasure of listening to him, has always gone out of his way to applaud Mr. Haldane's Territorial system; but it is quite true that he has added to that an expression of his belief that that system, as at present instituted, will fail to give us anything like the number of men that are required.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I never accused Lord Roberts of having attacked the Territorial system, because, as we all know, he has expressed a general approval of it; but he has so far attacked the whole policy of my right hon. friend as to say that he considered the provision of men for the Home Army to be entirely inadequate.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I rather think the noble Earl did use the word "attack" in connection with Lord Roberts' speech; this evening, however, the only point really before us is the very specific and well-defined point raised by my noble friend on the back Bench. He challenged the accuracy of Mr. Haldane's statement in his Guildford speech, and the noble Lord who so well represents the War Office made a very interesting attempt to justify Mr. Haldane's conclusion. He gave us a profit and loss account —I think that was the expression he used—or a statement of the manner in which the War Office regarded the profit and loss account, the profit being the number of men added to the Army by recent changes and the loss being the loss sustained in men and officers owing to the breaking up of old units. These statistics are not always very easy to handle or to follow, and I confess I do not think the noble Lord was entirely successful in bringing out the total profit claimed by Mr. Haldane at Guildford. The only point that I did, I think, gather clearly from the noble Lord was that whilst we are not at liberty to count amongst the Regular Army the Militia as we used to know it, noble Lords opposite do think themselves entitled to count in the Regular Army the Special Reservists, who, my noble friend maintains, are the Militia under a different name. But I really rose for the purpose of making a humble suggestion which I think may, perhaps, be helpful. Would it not be possible for the noble Lord to lay on the Table in the simplest and most intelligible form a statement of the profit and loss account on which he relies?

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: And the cost.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My noble friend suggests that to that might be added a statement of the cost under the old and under the new system. We have before us an interesting Return, moved for by my noble friend, and I was looking at it whilst the noble Lord opposite was speaking; but I am bound to say that I could not work it out so as to show the credit balance which the Under-Secretary so confidently claims. I hope, therefore, the noble Lord will consider whether he can give us the calculation on which he relies.

*THE EARL OF ERROLL: If the profit and loss account is laid on the Table, I hope it will include the whole armed strength of the country now and three years ago.

*LORD LUCAS: I really think the Paper which has been laid before Parliament at the instance of the noble Viscount contains all the information that has been asked for. It contains the difference in strength and in establishment between the Regular Army now and in 1905; it contains also a comparison between the Militia in 1905 and the Special Reserve now, and the Volunteers in 1905 and the Territorial Army now; and, finally there is a statement on the last page as to the Reserves in 1905 and now. I should have thought that that gave all the information asked for. If, however, noble Lords will specify particular points concerning which they desire additional information, I will see whether the Return can be amplified in order to meet their wishes.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

THE SMALL HOLDINGS ACT.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW rose to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture the following Questions: (1) whether the Local Government Board and the Public Works Loan Commissioners will lend money for the full periods fixed for loans under the Small Holdings Acts and whether the President of the Board of Agriculture will say under what authority a refusal to lend for such full period is based; (2) whether it is the intention of the Local Government Board to subject proposals of a county council to the examination of the officials of that Department, as well as of the Board of Agriculture, before granting sanction to a loan, thereby considerably increasing the cost of the land to the small holder; (3) whether, if any part of the sinking fund to repay the cost of the purchase of a small holding is borne by the county rate instead of by the small holding tenant, and the scheme results in a loss, the Treasury will refuse to bear any part of such loss; (4) in cases where a council takes on lease, either by agreement or compulsorily, land with a prospective but not immediate building value, subject to the rights of resumption under Clause 33 of the Small Holdings Act, 1907, what time would be granted for a loan for the erection of buildings and houses thereon; also whether the compensation for unexhausted improvements effected by the tenant, which will be useless to the person using such land for building purposes, must fall on the county rate; (5) whether the Board will sanction the addition of 5 per cent. on land, 10 per cent. on buildings, and 12 per cent. on dwelling-houses to the rental of small holdings, for repairs and management, or what percentage meets with the approval of the Board; (6) whether in the event of the breach by one of the sub-tenants of a county council of the covenants of a lease, the enalty for which was re-entry, the ndlord would be entitled also to resume ossession of the land occupied by the ther sub-tenants; (7) whether, in the pinion of the Board, the occupation of piece of grass land provided as a small olding by a county council for the urpose of grazing a pony or cows is a ompliance with the provision of Section of the Act of 1907, that a small holder ust himself cultivate the holding; (8) hether in cases where farm labourers pply to be put in the position of small olders instead of farm labourers, but re called on to vacate their cottages make room for their successors as bourers on the farm, the county council hould erect new cottages for them, or ay acquire their present cottages either y agreement or under compulsion;) whether, in the opinion of the Board, is the duty of a county borough to rovide land for small holders outside e county, if they cannot do so within, r persons who will thus cease to be ounty ratepayers; (10) whether the oard of Agriculture will fix a date at hich it will notify to councils in whose unties there remains an unsatisfied emand for small holdings the date by hich, in the opinion of the Board, such emand should be satisfied, and in default which it will be the duty of the Board prepare a scheme; and, if so, what otice will be given of the intention to such a date; (11) whether, in the inion of the Board of Agriculture, in ses where in any district there are only oderate sized holdings of about 100 res held mainly in connection with ral industries, a county council should tertain applications to have them oken up for holdings of 50 acres or der; and (12) whether the President the Board of Agriculture will take te of the many and serious difficulties hich have arisen in the administration the Acts, and institute an inquiry ereon with a view to the introduction an amending Bill to overcome them.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I nk I owe an apology to your Lordships the length of the Questions which pear in my name on the Paper, but m not going to dwell at any length upon em. I wish to refer only to two of em—the first and the third Questions, which deal with the length of time which will be allowed for the repayment of loans on houses and buildings. A period of eighty years is allowed in the case of land, and, of course, the small sum necessary to be set aside as a sinking fund is not a serious item in the rent; but when you come to the question of buildings and houses, instead of eighty years, you are cut down to thirty years, and in some cases, I am told, to under fifteen years, which makes a serious difference to the small holder in the rent he has to pay. For your Lordships must recollect that the small holder is required not only to pay the rent for the land which he hires and the interest on the cost of the buildings, but also to pay off the loan on the land and buildings within a certain number of years; that is to say, at the end of that period the county council becomes the happy possessor of the land, houses, and buildings for nothing. To show how great a difference the term of repayment may make, I would like to take a few concrete cases within my own knowledge. The first case is that of buildings about to be put up at a cost of £800. If eighty years were allowed, the annual charge would be £30, but if only thirty years were allowed, the annual charge would be £44, which, over a holding of 145 acres, would amount to an additional rent of 2s. per acre. The second case is that of a farm of 115 acres where £350 has to be spent on buildings. In this case the difference between eighty and thirty years would be not less than 1s. per acre. I also have a third case where the difference would be 1s. 6d. per acre. Surely there is no necessity to fix so short a period as thirty years. I think county councils may be relied upon to see that the buildings are kept in proper order and in substantial repair. As to the other Questions on the Paper, some of them have been answered to individual county councils, but I thought it would be of great assistance to all who are administering the Act if the Answers could be more generally known. Others were addressed to the noble Earl on the occasion of a conference which he summoned of representatives of county councils of England and Wales on the subject of the administration of the Small Holdings Act. That conference lasted some time. A full Report of the proceedings is on the Table, but I have looked through the Report in vain to find what answers were returned to those Questions. The proceedings seem to have been interrupted by the well-known hospitality of my noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture, which has been one of his characteristics ever since he first entered public life. The whole of the conference were taken off to an excellent luncheon. They, no doubt, returned replete with the comforts of this life, but very empty-handed as regarded the questions which they addressed to the noble Earl. I thought, therefore, that the noble Earl would acquit me of any desire to hamper his Department if, for the information of those genuinely interested in small holdings, I gave him this opportunity of replying to the Questions that he did not answer on the occasion to which I have referred.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, in reply to the first Question I have to say that the Board of Agriculture have been in communication with the Local Government Board on the subject, and it has been agreed between us that the Local Government Board, when so requested by the county councils, in the case of the purchase of land for small holdings, will grant loans for the full period of eighty years; and, as regards buildings, whether purchased with land or erected by councils, they will grant further loans for whatsoever period is justified by the character and probable life of the buildings up to the maximum of fifty years allowed by the Act. In the case of buildings erected upon land leased by the councils, of course the term of the loan will not exceed that of the lease, except where the lease provides that compensation is payable by the landlord for the buildings on the termination of the lease. The Board of Agriculture are so far quite satisfied with the arrangement. We have got a very good working arrangement, and I think there need be no fear that we have come to a very satisfactory arrangement on the subject of the first Question.

Then the noble Earl asks whether it is the intention of the Local Government Board to subject proposals of a county council to the examination of the officials of that Department, as well as of the Board of Agriculture, before granting sanction to a loan. Of course, if the Local Government Board did that in every case it would be what is called an intolerable strain; but the Local Government Board have stated that in ordinary cases they do not think it necessary to hold an inquiry on their own account. Hence I do not think it need be anticipated that any examination of a case which they may make will really increase the cost of land to the small holder.

The Answer to the third Question—whether, if any part of the sinking fund to repay the cost of the purchase of a small holding is borne by the county rate instead of by the small holding tenant, and the scheme results in a loss, the Treasury will refuse to bear any part of such loss—is in the negative. They will not refuse to do so; but the Treasury Minute requires that the Board should certify that a council had used their best endeavours to obtain rent at the amounts necessary to recoup all the council's expenses. In view of the terms on which money can be borrowed under the Act, there really is no hardship on the councils. I honestly think that, under the new *regime*, people will be able to get small pieces of land, generally speaking, at lower rents than they could do formerly when from £8 to £20 an acre has been charged to these poor people for land for which farmers used to pay from 15s. to 20s. an acre.

As to the fourth Question, in some cases it would be possible, but in many cases that must be recognised as im practicable. In reply to the fifth Ques tion, 15 per cent. would be about fai for all repairs, management, insurance etc., where there are houses and build ings; and where there are no house or buildings we think that about 7 per cent. might probably be required Question No. 6 is a legal conundrum and I do not think I need go into i deeply. I am told that certain section of the Conveyancing and Law of Propert

Acts, 1881 and 1892, which deal with rights of re-entry and forfeiture of leases, meet this difficulty. I do not profess to understand it, but that is the legal answer. The Answer to the seventh Question is: Yes. It is immaterial whether the land is used for grazing a cow or a pony. The Circular of 26th May, 1908, disposed entirely of that question.

The noble Earl next inquires whether in cases where farm labourers apply to be put in the position of small holders instead of farm labourers, but are called on to vacate their cottages to make room for their successors as labourers on the farm, the county council should erect new cottages for them, or may acquire their present cottages either by agreement or under compulsion. The Answer is that where a council desires to house applicants for small holdings they may either erect new cottages or purchase existing ones; but as a general rule, there would be difficulties in the way of compulsory hiring. Of course, the question of turning labourers out of their cottages is very much to be deplored. I may, perhaps, call the attention of the noble Earl to the case of Ireland — people seem much more favoured there than in this country. Under the Labourers' Cottages (Ireland) Act, where the accommodation is deficient or unfit, labourers have to be supplied by the district council with houses.

The point dealt with in Question No. 9 is practically the London problem—the problem of the urban boroughs, where it is the duty to provide land for small holdings outside the county. That is the great question of London, which is under consideration, and perhaps the noble Earl will forgive me if I do not go deeply into it to-night. Next, the noble Earl asks whether the Board of Agriculture will fix a date at which it will notify to councils in whose counties there remains an unsatisfied demand for small holdings the date by which, in the opinion of the Board, such demand should be satisfied, and in default of which it will be the duty of the Board to prepare a scheme. There is a great deal to be said for this suggestion. Under the Act six months is put as a limit, but I do not honestly think that the time has yet come to accept the suggestion. Speaking generally, I think county councils are endeavouring, to the best of their ability, to meet the Act. The Act requires that if the Board are of opinion that a scheme should be brought forward in any particular county, and if they inform the council accordingly, they are allowed six months to prepare a scheme before the Board can act in default.

The answer to the question whether, in the opinion of the Board of Agriculture, in cases where in any district there are only moderate-sized holdings of about 100 acres held mainly in connection with rural industries, a county council should entertain applications to have them broken up for holdings of fifty acres or under, is to be found in the account of the Conference to which the noble Earl has referred. It is impossible for the Board to give an answer to hypothetical cases of this sort. The county councils are, after all, reasonable men, and they can be trusted to act in a reasonable manner. I do not think it is very likely that in ordinary circumstances such a state of things should arise. Of course, if it is necessary, those men who hold 100 acres must give up the land, but, generally, some other and better arrangements can be made.

As to the last question, I do not think I can admit that the difficultes are either numerous or very serious. The administration of the Act is difficult, and the principal difficulty is, of course, the very large demand which has been disclosed from suitable men. We are overwhelmed with the demand for land, which used to be denied, but which I think now is generally accepted. Every officer in my Department is working double time to meet the demand, and the Treasury have told me that they will be generous in giving me as much more assistance as I may reasonably require. I think that, on the whole, though some people are a little bit disappointed that we have not gone still faster than we have, the Act is working extremely well, and I should be very much disappointed if, by next Michaelmas, we have not 100,000 acres in this country under small holdings. I do not think that an inquiry into the

Act at the present moment would serve any useful purpose, and I respectfully ask that I may have a little more breathing time, say, till next Michaelmas, to see what progress has been made then.

LORD MONK-BRETTON: My Lords, the other day I asked the noble Lord who represents the Local Government Board in this House several questions with regard to the terms for the repayment of loans for the purposes of this Act, and I received categorical answers. I also called attention at the time to the fact that the statement which was then made by Lord Allendale, on behalf of the Local Government Board, differed entirely from that contained in a letter on the same subject which several local authorities had received from the Local Government Board. A month has elapsed since I called attention to the matter, and the local authorities are in precisely the same position as they were then. The county councils have received different answers from the Local Government Board with regard to the terms of the loan from those stated in this House, and I suggest that it might be practicable to issue regulations or a circular to the county councils explaining exactly what is the position, so that they may be able to proceed with the Act. As things are, county councils are being hardly treated in this matter. The Act has been in force since January and we are now in the last month of the year; yet to this day the county councils have not had clear instructions as to how they are to administer the Act. I therefore hope the noble Earl will see his way to issue regulations or a circular on the subject.

EARL CARRINGTON: This is a very important point, and I am much obliged to the noble Lord for mentioning it. I will at once consult with the Local Government Board on the subject and see whether a notice might be circulated to remove any misunderstanding there may be, though I was not aware that there was any misunderstanding.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I should like to ask the noble Earl whether, in the case of a scheme which has been approved by the Board of Agriculture, the Local Government Board will insist on sending down their own valuer, and, if so, whether there is any appeal as to a difference between the two valuers.

EARL CARRINGTON: I think that, in ordinary cases, the Local Government Board will accept the valuation of the Board of Agriculture and give us credit for trying to be fair to all parties. I hope that any difficulty of the kind referred to by my noble friend will be entirely avoided in the future.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1903.

Copy presented, of Order No. 7619, dated 28th November, 1908, permitting the landing at a Foreign Animals Wharf in Great Britain of Animals carried on board the ss. "Titian" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS ACTS, 1877 AND 1907.

Copy presented, of an Order dated 27th November, 1908, entitled the "American Gooseberry Mildew (Wisbech and District) Order of 1908" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

LUNACY.

Copy of Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the Visitors of Lunatics during the six months ending on 30th September, 1908 [by Act.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Land Purchase.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what steps tenants on an estate may take to enable them to purchase their holdings where the lease under which the middle landlord holds from the head landlord has not a sufficient number of years to run to entitle him to sell under the Land Act, 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Where in the case of a sale of an estate, lands held by a middleman are in the exclusive occupation of one or more sub-tenants, and the provisions of Section 15 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, apply, the Estates Commissioners have power to redeem the intervening interest when dealing with the estate under that Act.

Women Clerks and Inspectors in the Home Office.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there are any women clerks or inspectors in his Department, and, if any, will he give the numbers in each division.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The Answer is in the affirmative. The numbers and positions occupied are as follows: Fifteen inspectors of factories and workshops; six clerks in the factory department; one sub-inspector of reformatory and industrial schools; one inspector of prisons and inebriate reformatories.

Loss of the "Spartan Prince."

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the loss of the steamer "Spartan Prince," and if he can state why no inquiry has been held with reference to the loss of this vessel; and whether he is aware that some of the crew have made lengthy affidavits stating that the circumstances under which this vessel foundered were not satisfactory.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) My attention has been called to the loss of the steamer "Spartan Prince" after collision with the ship "Timandra," but, in the absence of the latter vessel from this country, I have not considered it desirable to order a formal investigation which, in the circumstances, must be of an *ex parte* character. No affidavits have been received from the crew, whilst the preliminary inquiries made at Ceara, Barbados, and in this country do not seem to call for further investigation; but I shall be prepared to consider any fresh information that may be brought to my notice with a view to any further action that may be found desirable.

Spanish Crew of the Steamer "Cartsdyke."

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it has been brought to his notice that the owners of the steamer "Cartsdyke," now bound from Bilbao, Spain, to Ayr, Scotland, is carrying a number of Spaniards who are to be engaged as the crew of the "Cartsdyke" in place of the men now serving on the vessel; whether he will take steps to insist that the language test will be applied to the Spaniards so as to see that they can comply with the requirements of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1906; and whether, in view of the number of unemployed in the United Kingdom at present, he will bring to the notice of the shipowners generally that by bringing in foreign labour numbers of our own countrymen are being thrown out of employment.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The "Cartsdyke" arrived at Ayr on 24th November. Inquiry has been made into the matter referred to in the Question, and I am informed that no foreign seamen have been brought to this country in the vessel as passengers for the purpose of being engaged in place of the men serving during the recent voyage. The provisions of Section 12 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1906, will be enforced in this and all similar cases, but I do not see my way to issue a general communication to shipowners in the sense suggested by my hon. friend.

Evicted Tenants—Delay in Reinstatement of Mrs. Margaret Rice.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain from the Estates Commissioners the cause of the delay in the reinstatement of Mrs. Margaret Rice in her old holding of Coole Upper, near Fermoy, on the M'Causland estate, County Cork.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have made a formal offer for the purchase of Mrs. Rice's former holding. This offer has been accepted by the owner, and it is expected that Mrs. Rice will be reinstated at an early date.

Illegal Trawling in Dundrum Bay.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland has been called to the injury caused to the fishing industry in Dundrum Bay, County Down, by illegal trawling; whether he is aware that the matter was brought under the notice of the Council of the Department at the last meeting; and what steps are being taken to deal with the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Department are aware that illegal trawling has been in progress by local boats in Dundrum Bay. Since March last the Department have instituted legal proceedings for this offence in ten cases. Three more are pending. The Department will spare no effort to capture offenders, and hope that the local magistrates will inflict such penalties as may prove effectual in stopping illegal trawling. I understand that the matter was discussed at the meeting of the Council of Agriculture on the 24th ultimo, when, after the Department's explanation, the resolution of Colonel Sharman-Crawford dealing with the matter was not pressed.

Privileged Cabs at Woolwich Station.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will inquire of the Woolwich police as to the working of the privilege cab system at the Arsenal Station; whether it would be in the interest of the travelling public to declare the station an open one; and whether friction is caused by the privileged cabmen taking the outside stands in addition to the privilege stand.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The inquiry which, as I informed the hon. Member last Monday, I am making into this matter is not yet completed. I hope to be able to inform him of my decision very shortly.

Compensation under Licensing Act, 1904.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now prepared to consider favourably any application by the Quarter Sessions of a county for his consent to the borrowing on the security of the compensation fund of any sums required for the purpose of paying compensation under the Licensing Act, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) In my Answer on this subject on 12th April last I gave an anticipated change in the law as my reason for limiting to the present year the period of repayment of loans applied for under the Act of 1904. In the absence of this reason I should, of course, not think it necessary to impose such a limit.

Procedure in County Courts.

MR. T. R. BETHELL (Essex, Maldon): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if the Lord Chancellor has appointed a Commission to advise him as to the procedure of the County Courts and as to improving that procedure, or what is the nature of the Commission now inquiring and to whom will its Report be made; and whether it will, as soon as practicable, be issued to the Members of this House or brought to the attention of the House; and whether the inquiry will extend to the question of the fees charged in the County Courts and to the complaint that they are excessive, and to the working of the system of administration orders.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The Judicature Committee (presided over by Lord Macnaghten) in their

Report, recently presented, recommended amongst other things, that: "The Lord Chancellor be requested to appoint a Committee to consider the relations now subsisting between the High Court and the County Courts, and to report whether any and what alteration or modification should be made in those relations, and consequently in the jurisdiction and practice of the County Courts." In pursuance of that recommendation, the Lord Chancellor has invited a Departmental Committee, with Sir J. Gorell Barnes as chairman, to consider and advise him on the subject.

Wages Dispute at Grangemouth.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that a Grangemouth employer of dock labour has dismissed certain men because they have instituted legal proceedings against him to secure the short payment of wages which he has withheld from them on the piece work system; and if he contemplates any action to prevent employers taking such action against men who are demanding simple justice.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have seen the letter which the hon. Member has been good enough to send me on the subject of the case referred to in the Question. The matter is outside the powers conferred by the Factory Act, and there is no action which it is possible for me to take to protect workmen, but the question of checking piecework wages in dock labour has been the subject of inquiry by a Departmental Committee, who have now reported, and I hope next session to introduce legislation which will place the workers in a different position in this matter.

The Press and Coroners' Courts.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department with reference to the exclusion of the accredited representatives of the Press agencies and of the daily papers from the coroner's Court of St. Giles's, London, on the 21st ultimo, whether his attention has been called to the fact that one of those representatives was in Court before the coroner arrived and was requested to leave, and that the other representatives arrived before the inquest opened; whether he is aware that the Press box was almost empty; whether, in face of those statements, he has any further information as to why these Press representatives were excluded; whether he can explain why the written protest from the journalists was not at once delivered to the coroner; and whether the coroner's officer has been admonished.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in reference to the exclusion of certain recognised Press representatives from the coroner's Court of St. Giles's, London, on the 21st ultimo, whether he has been made aware that the reporters who were excluded had not arrived late; that one of them at least was actually inside the Court when the coroner arrived, and was ordered out by the coroner's officer; that there was no overcrowding in the Court, inasmuch as a solitary police inspector was occupying the Press box; in the light of this fresh evidence will he renew his inquiries into the matter of complaint; and will he take such measures as will insure the publicity, in conformity with immemorial usage, of coroners' quests.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I beg leave to answer this and the next Question together. I have again communicated with the coroner, and I learn from him that a gentleman who had entered the Court before the coroner had arrived was requested to leave until the Court was open. The coroner regrets that any representative of the Press should have been excluded, and assures me that such a thing has not happened before and is not likely to happen again. His officer states positively that he received no written communication, and that he was not aware of its existence. I do not think that the incident calls for any further action on my part. I have no authority to issue instructions to coroners in this matter, and it is clear from the coroner's statement that he is anxious to give full facilities for the presence of the Press in Court.

Case of J. J. Jelly, of Workington.

MR. CROOKS: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of John James Jelly, heard at the Workington Police Court on 25th November, who was proved to be in great poverty from unemployment and had a dying child, and that there was neither fire nor food in his house, who was sentenced to fourteen days imprisonment for stealing coal of the value of 2s. 2d., the defence being that he could not get a ticket for work and wanted the coppers to buy milk for his child; and will he take steps to reduce the sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have made inquiry into this case, but I have found no ground for intervention on my part. The prisoner has been discharged on part payment of the fine. This was his third conviction of stealing during the present year.

Rent of Teacher's House in Elementary Schools.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the word "schoolhouse," in the Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill, does or does not include the teacher's house in those public elementary schools where rent is now paid by the local authority to the trustees of the school.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I would draw the hon. Member's attention to the provisions in regard to the teacher's house which are proposed by a Government Amendment to Clause 5 which is on today's Paper.

Cooper School, Marston Sicca.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether a settlement has been made of the affairs of the Cooper School at Marston Sicca, Gloucestershire; and, if so, what are its terms.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Board have consented to postpone further proceedings in this case pending a joint meeting of parish councils and other local bodies interested which, it is understood, is being convened to consider the terms of the draft scheme.

Elementary Education—Administrative and Loan Charges.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state what was the average sum per child spent by local education authorities on administration and loan charges during the year ending 31st March, 1907, in London, the county boroughs, London and the county boroughs taken together, and throughout the country.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*)—

England and Wales.	Administration.		Loan Charges.	
	Total.	Per Child.	Total.	Per Child
	£.	s. d.	£.	s. d.
London - - - -	237,894	7 2	757,002	22 1
County boroughs - - -	303,438	3 10	757,257	9 8
London and county boroughs -	541,332	4 10	1,514,259	13 7
Total—England and Wales -	1,093,879	4 1	2,420,582	9 1

Cost of Medical Inspection of Schools.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he has received representations from local authorities drawing his attention to the expense of medical inspection provided for by the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act of last year ; and whether any further assistance is to be provided from the Exchequer so as to enable this inspection to be carried on efficiently.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have already stated that there is, in my opinion, the strongest objection to giving special grants for specific purposes in connection with elementary education, but under the financial proposals in connection with the Bill now before the House local education authorities will receive a large additional grant to assist them in carrying out medical inspection and their other duties in respect of elementary education.

Secondary Schools and Training Colleges

Sir PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) : To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he intends the education settlement to be produced by the Education Bill to include a settlement of the difficulties that have arisen in the last three years in regard to secondary schools and training colleges ; and, in particular, whether, in that event, he intends to make the requisite modifications in the secondary schools and training college regulations so that denominational schools and colleges shall receive grants from the Board of Education equivalent to the grants for those provided by the local authority, as will be the case in regard to elementary schools under the settlement embodied in the Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The various points referred to by the hon. Member do not arise under the Education Bill, which deals only with elementary education. If the Bill now under discussion is passed, the position of Nonconformists and others who are now under disabilities in other parts of the public educational system will no doubt be affected thereby, but the hon. Member's Questions are hypothetical, and it would be premature for me to give him a definite reply at present.

Out-Relief Administration at Wavertree.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS : To ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been directed to the practice of paying outdoor relief on the premises of a political club at Wavertree, Liverpool, though the town hall is situated nearly opposite the club in question ; whether he can state to what extent this practice prevails ; if it meets with his sanction ; and, if not, will he take steps to end it.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am informed that under agreements dating from 1889 the guardians have the use of a large room as a pay station at the Conservative Working Men's Club at Wavertree. The rent paid is £7 a year, which includes heating, cleaning, and accommodation for about 100 persons. The room is used for a short time once a week, and is then exclusively in the occupation of the guardians. No sanction on the part of the Local Government Board has been given in this matter. As regards the town hall, I am informed that it is improbable that any application by the guardians to the corporation for the hire of a room large enough for the purpose for which it would be required would be acceded to.

Law Officers of the Crown and Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. SNOWDEN (Blackburn) : To ask the President of the Local Government Board when he hopes to receive the opinions of the Law Officers on the points which have been submitted to them arising out of the Old-Age Pensions Act.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have submitted two cases to the Law Officers on questions arising out of the Act. I have received their opinion in one of the cases, and as regards the other I have asked them to let me have their opinion at the earliest date practicable.

Distress at Grays Thurrock.

Mr. WARDLE (Stockport) : To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received an application from the Grays Thurrock Urban District Council for sanction to create a distress committee ; and whether he is prepared to grant the application.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I received an application for this purpose on Tuesday last, and I have referred it to the inspector of the district to report to me upon it.

Loughborough Distress.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received an application from the town council of Loughborough for sanction to create a distress committee; and, if so, whether he is prepared to grant the application.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received the application referred to, and have decided to comply with it.

Wimbledon Distress.

MR. CLYNES: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any application has been made to his Board by the town council of Wimbledon for sanction to appoint a distress committee; and, if so, whether he can state the nature of the reply given.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) No actual application for the establishment of a distress committee has been made by the town council of Wimbledon this winter, but they have applied for a contribution from the Parliamentary grant. I wrote on 4th November, asking for particulars of unemployment, schemes of work, etc., but I have not so far received any reply beyond an acknowledgment.

Chiswick Distress.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether an application has been received from the urban district council of Chiswick for sanction to appoint a distress committee; and whether his Board is prepared to grant the application.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received an application in the sense referred to in the Question. As the district council have arranged contracts for the execution of works estimated at cost in the aggregate over £26,000, all of which will contain a clause that local labour shall be employed, I have suggested that the question of establishing a distress committee might be deferred.

Brentford Distress.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his Board has received an application from the urban district council of Brentford for sanction to create a distress committee; and whether his Board is prepared to grant the application.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received the application, but in view of the small population, and of the other circumstances, I do not think I should be justified in acceding to it.

Harrogate Distress.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received an application from the town council of Harrogate for sanction to create a distress committee; and whether he is prepared to grant the application.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I do not find that I have received any such application from the town council of Harrogate since 1905.

Stoke-on-Trent Distress.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is in receipt of an application from the borough of Stoke-on-Trent for sanction to create a distress committee; whether two previous applications have been made and sanction has been refused; and whether, in view of the desire prevalent in Stoke for a distress committee, he is prepared to grant the present application.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have not hitherto seen my way to establish a distress committee in the borough of Stoke-on-Trent. I have now a renewed application from the town council before me which I am considering.

Folkestone Distress.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any reply has yet been given by his Board to the application of the town council of Folkestone for sanction to create a distress committee; and if so, will he state the nature of the reply.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have not seen my way to establish a distress committee at Folkestone at the present time.

Memoranda on Fiscal Policy.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will consent to issue an official Memorandum by Professor Hewins on the Fiscal Policy of International Trade in the same way as he has issued a Memorandum by Professor Marshall on the same subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) As my right hon. friend stated in reply to the hon. Member for Dulwich on the 24th ultimo, Mr. Marshall's Memorandum was prepared for and on the invitation of the late Government, and was only published owing to the hon. Member's own request. He at the same time explained why he considered it undesirable to issue a rejoiner at the public expense.

Irish Old-Age Pension Claimants.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the official estimate of the number of persons in Ireland over seventy years of age in 1908 is 184,000; whether he is aware that the official estimate of the numbers of the same class of persons in 1907 was 173,359; whether the wide discrepancy between these two estimates casts doubt on the accuracy of both; and will he take steps to obtain a less speculative estimate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The estimated number of persons in Ireland of the age of seventy years and upwards in the middle of the year 1908 was 183,639. For the middle of 1907 the estimate was 183,876.

Registration of Births in Ireland.

MR. KETTLE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the system of registration of births in Ireland is of much more recent origin than the corresponding system in Great Britain; whether, consequently, the materials available for forming an estimate of the numbers of the population over seventy years of age are much less adequate in Ireland than in great Britain; and whether the figure, 184,000, is in fact anything more than a rough approximation founded largely on guess-work.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The system of registration of births in Ireland is of much more recent origin than the corresponding system in Great Britain, but this fact has no relation to the question of estimating the number of persons of the age of seventy years and upwards at the present time. The figure 183,639, or in round numbers 184,000, is not a guess but a fairly approximate estimate, obtained by applying the percentage of males and females, aged seventy years and upwards, as ascertained at the census of 1901, to the estimated total number of males and females in the middle of the year 1908.

Pensions and Profits on Small Holdings.

MR. KETTLE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether private instructions have been issued to pension officers prescribing the mode in which they are to calculate the profits derived from small holdings in Ireland; whether he is aware that in many cases the pension officers estimate these profits as being twice the Poor Law valuation; and, if private instructions have been issued, will he communicate them to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) My right hon. friend cannot add anything to the replies which he has already given on this subject. As he has already explained, each case has to be dealt with on its merits. Confidential instructions have been given to pension officers as to the general lines upon which they should guide themselves in their reports to the committees; but these instructions do not—nor is it in his opinion desirable that they should—bind the committees, or (upon appeal) the Local Government Board, whose duty it is to exercise an independent discretion in the matter. For this reason, it does not appear to him to be desirable to publish the confidential instructions in question.

Irish Taxation.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can form any estimate of the probable amount of extra taxation that will be imposed upon Ireland in respect of old-age pensions.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) It is not possible to answer this Question until the amount of the extra taxation (if any) required has been determined, the precise taxes to be imposed have been decided on, and their incidence as between Great Britain and Ireland has been ascertained.

London Education Grant.

MR. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, as London receives from existing grants payable in respect of elementary education a lower grant than the rest of England and Wales, he will exempt London from the proposed limitation of 6s. per child under the new grants A, B, and C contained in the financial proposals in connection with the Education Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The question of these grants is being very carefully considered, but my right hon. friend is not in a position to make any announcement at present.

Pension Regulations.

MR. SNOWDEN: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have given instructions to the pension officers that when the officer has reported to the committee that the claimant is entitled to a pension, and the committee consider that the claimant is disqualified, the appeal, if any, should be made by the claimant; and whether, seeing that such instructions deprive the pension officer of a statutory right given to him by the Old-Age Pensions Act, he will have this instruction at once withdrawn.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The circumstances in which a pension officer should or should not exercise the rights he possesses under the Act appear to my right hon. friend to be a proper subject for the issue of directions by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue under Article 34 of the Regulations, and the instruction itself seems to him to be a proper one, since, if the claimant is satisfied with an adverse decision of the pension committee, he can see no reason why the pension officer should seek to interfere. He does not, therefore, propose to take any action.

Poor Relief Disqualification.

MR. SNOWDEN: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have instructed the pension officers that receipt of poor relief by a husband will not in their opinion disqualify his wife for receipt for an old-age pension; is he aware that this is one of the points on which the Local Government Board has not made up its mind; and will he say if the Commissioners of Inland Revenue or the Local Government Board is the authority for deciding points of law under the Old-Age Pensions Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) Neither the pension officer nor the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have any power to decide questions under the Old-Age Pensions Act. The decision upon all such questions, whether of law or facts, rests under the Act with the local pension committee subject to appeal to the Local Government Board. As regards the particular point raised in the Question I understand that my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board is advised that, in cases in which a husband has received poor relief for, or on account of, his wife, the wife as well as the husband is disqualified. Pension officers have now been instructed accordingly.

Census of Production Returns.

MR. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Excise officers recently made old-age pension officers had placed upon them the duty of collecting the census of production returns; whether agriculturists in many cases objected to make such returns, and even refused to make their ordinary agricultural returns, thus causing the necessity of personal visits and inquiries by the officer; and what payment for these extra services and out-of-pocket expenses will be made to such officers, and when.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) My right hon. friend is informed that the Board of Inland Revenue are not aware that greater difficulty than usual has been experienced by the officers in collecting the agricultural returns. The question of the additional remuneration to be paid to officers for collecting the census of production returns is now being considered by the Board.

Pay of Old-Age Pension Officers.

MR. RENDALL: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when a definite statement will be made by him to old-age pension officers as to the rates of remuneration to be paid them for their work; what number of hours they are supposed to work daily; whether Sunday work is invited, expected, allowed, or disallowed; and what extra rates of pay will be paid them for weekday and Sunday overtime.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The question of remuneration will be considered at as early a date as is compatible with the obtaining of full materials for a decision, after the close of the exceptional work for which a gratuity is contemplated. The nature of the duties does not admit of rules being laid down as to daily hours of work, nor have any instructions been given as to work on Sundays.

Fruit Tree Washes.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the value of nicotine washes for spraying fruit trees and the present high cost of such washes, he will take steps to remit the Excise Duty on all tobacco grown in the United Kingdom which is manufactured for horticultural or agricultural purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) All nicotine is already manufactured from duty-free tobacco.

Fines on Pension Officers.

MR. SNOWDEN: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that the Board of Inland Revenue have inflicted a fine of £10 on each of a number of pension officers who have innocently made public the number of claims for pensions received in their districts; that when the attention of the officers was called to the statement that their action was a breach of official regulations they readily admitted their fault and expressed regret; and whether he will take action to modify the severity of the punishment.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) My right hon. friend is aware of the action taken by the Board of Inland Revenue in punishing certain Excise officers who violated the regulations against communicating to the public Press information derived from official sources. If the officers in question had not expressed their regret for their action, a more severe view would necessarily have been taken of conduct which is subversive of all discipline and tends to bring discredit on the public service. He is not prepared to modify the punishment imposed in these cases.

War Office Tailors.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the War Office forward to each officer about to join his regiment a list containing the names of several tailoring firms, to one of whom he is recommended to go for his outfit, to the exclusion of other Army outfitters; and whether this form of preferential treatment has received his sanction, and can he state on what grounds.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) All officers on being gazetted to commissions are furnished with the price lists of the tailors and outfitters who furnish price lists for this purpose. No particular firm is recommended by the War Office and no firm is precluded from being placed on the list.

Volunteer Decorations.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the enhanced value likely to be placed upon the Volunteer officers' decoration and the Volunteer long-service medal, he will take steps to secure that officers, non-commissioned officers, and men who have transferred from the Volunteer Force to the Territorial Army receive the Volunteer officers' decoration or the Volunteer long-service medal in lieu of the corresponding decoration and medal instituted for the Territorial Army, provided that the officers, non-commissioned officers, and men fulfil the conditions of service which governed the Volunteer decoration and the Volunteer long-service medal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) In view of the fact that the conditions attached to the grant of the Territorial decoration and efficiency medal are more stringent than those formerly called for in respect to the Volunteer rewards, I cannot concur in the opinion expressed by my hon. friend as regards the latter, and I am not prepared to take the steps suggested in the Question.

Territorial Efficiency Medal.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the conditions governing the Territorial efficiency medal have been so framed as to exclude from the conferring of this distinction officers who have previously served in the ranks; whether he is aware that an officer of the Volunteer Force who had served in the ranks became eligible for and received the Volunteer long-service medal; and whether he will take steps to secure that officers of the Territorial Army shall be treated in the same way as regards the Territorial efficiency medal as were officers of the Volunteer Force as regards the Volunteer long-service medal

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The medal was granted to Volunteer officers on retirement after twenty years service if they had served in the ranks, but had not served long enough to earn the decoration. The efficiency medal is granted to the Territorial Force after twelve years service, while the decoration is granted after twenty years service, and, therefore, the proposal of my hon. friend does not appear to be practicable.

Re-enlistments.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether men of the Territorial Force, who re-engage at the end of the period of service for which they enlisted, must under existing conditions be enlisted and attested a second time; and, if so, whether he will take steps to obviate the annoyance and inconvenience which this will inevitably cause before the first year of service in the Territorial Force expires.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A man of the Territorial Force who, on the termination of his current engagement, desires to continue has only to sign the re-engagement paper. It is not considered that this procedure can cause annoyance or inconvenience.

Musketry Training Committee.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War who were the expert officers of the Regular and Territorial Forces who are stated, in paragraph 8 of Circular Memorandum, No. 111 of 13th November, 1908, to have brought out the new musketry course and instructions after much careful consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The Committee on the musketry training of the Territorial Force was composed as follows: Lieutenant-General Mackinnon (Chairman); Brigadier-General Murray (Director of Military Training); Colonel Egerton (Commandant School of Musketry); Colonel Cotton Jodrell; Colonels Fremantle and Wilson, and Major Gosling, representing the Territorial Force; Majors Shute H. C. Hill, and Kirwan, with Captain T. H. Davidson as Secretary.

Army Boot Contracts.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the number of pairs of Army boots and shoes obtained during the years 1898–9, 1900–1, 1901–2, the names of counties or towns from which they were obtained, and the number of pairs each town or county supplied.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)

Statement of the Number of Army Boots and Shoes (machine made and hand sewn) received during the years 1898-9, 1900-1, 1901-2, and the County or Town from which they were obtained.

		Aberdeen.	Bristol.	Chesham.	Ipswich.	Leeds.	Leicester.	London.	Mansfield.	County of Northampton.	Norwich.	Total
1898–9	Boots -	—	—	—	—	—	—	107	—	585,825	—	585,932
	Shoes -	—	—	—	—	—	16,931	3,287	—	54,669	—	74,887
1900–1	Boots -	—	51,890	1,100	—	50,430	6,550	51,610	—	1,060,999	—	1,222,579
	Shoes -	—	15,050	—	34,480	2,000	57,299	94,857	2,000	411,012	13,120	629,818
1901–2*	Boots -	—	122,856	3,146	—	106,478	11,200	82,120	—	1,043,567	—	1,369,367
	Shoes -	4,854	—	—	—	—	—	13,050	—	47,951	—	65,855

* During this year an order was placed through the Government of India for the delivery of 100,000 pairs of boots direct to South Africa.

Musketry Practice.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War under what conditions the grouping practices of the new musketry course will be carried out on the numerous ranges on which, owing to the shooting taking place across a valley or ravine, firing at 100 yards range is impossible, and the approach from the firing points to the targets long and difficult, and, on the large ranges, such as Bisley and Wraysbury, where, owing to the large number of targets in use, great delay would be caused by the necessary interruption of firing while those who had fired on other targets were inspecting their group of shots.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The instructional practices are to act as a guide, and need not be rigidly adhered to. The whole object of the scheme is to enable commanding officers to make use of such facilities as are within their reach, placing a pattern before them to guide them on the right lines. On large ranges grouping practices can be commenced at the same time, and no great delay should occur. It is impossible to legislate for every class of range and every circumstance. I hope hon. Members will not prejudge this scheme before it has been put to a full test.

Territorial Ranges.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War in view of the fact that most ranges of the Territorial Force are open for class-firing at least twice a week during the spring and summer, what steps will be taken to secure the attendance of officers and details of other corps to carry out the marking and supervision as required by paragraph 8 of the musketry course.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Supervision and marking will only be performed by officers and men of other units during the annual test. The necessary arrangements will be made by the general officers commanding divisions of the Territorial Force and by officers commanding mounted brigades.

Use of Wind Gauge in Musketry Practice.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, owing to the extreme frequency with which the force of the wind changes in this climate, he will withdraw paragraph 18 of the new musketry instructions, which prohibits the alteration of the wind gauge after the first shot of a classification practice has been fired.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is owing to the extreme frequency with which the wind changes in this climate, and to the difficulties and inaccuracies which would arise on active service from frequent alteration of the wind gauge, that it is considered more advisable to practice making allowance for wind in this country by "aiming off."

Hayti Revolt.

MR. GLENDINNING (Antrim, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if it is the intention of the Government to send a man-of-war to Port-au-Prince, seeing the danger to which the lives and property of British subjects are exposed.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Grey.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answer returned to-day to the hon. Member for North-Western Lanarkshire.

Grehan Estate, Banteer.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have gazetted the holding on the Grehan estate, Banteer, County Cork, formerly in the occupation of Mr. Timothy Barrett; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that the land is untenanted, the Commissioners are taking steps to procure the reinstatement of the tenant with the least possible delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have notified in the Dublin *Gazette* their intention to acquire this holding under the Evicted Tenants Act, and are using all despatch in their proceedings under the Act.

Dublin Assistant Teachers.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the average salary of trained assistant teachers in ordinary national schools in Dublin city, model schools not included; why are assistant teachers in Dublin schools paid smaller salaries than assistant teachers in London, Edinburgh, or other English or Scottish towns, if they perform equally efficient work; is he aware that no assistant teacher in an ordinary national school in Ireland receives promotion, that is, he is placed in the lowest or third grade and must remain there, no matter what his qualifications and length of service, or how effective his work may be in the school; is he aware that married assistant teachers in Dublin pay from one-third to one-half their salaries for house rent alone, and cannot possibly live up to that standard of decency and respectability expected from those who educate the children of the citizens of Dublin, while unmarried assistants have to pay such high rents for rooms and board that they have not a living wage; and will he recommend the promotion of assistants to the higher grades, according to efficiency and length of service, as they receive the same training, pass the same examinations, possess equal qualifications, and with equal service are quite as efficient as principal teachers.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the average salary of the assistant teachers referred to in the Question is £79 17s. for men and £71 5s. 5d. for women. I am not in a position to compare the salary and work of assistant teachers in Dublin with that of assistant teachers in English and Scottish towns. Assistant teachers rank as a rule in the third grade, but there are exceptions to this rule. None have as yet been promoted to a higher grade since 1900. I have no means of ascertaining what house rents they pay. The Commissioners' rules provide for increases of salary to assistant teachers and for their promotion in exceptional circumstances, but it was never contemplated nor would the Commissioners consider it desirable to give assistants the same rights as principals in regard to promotion. The Commissioners desire that principals should, as a rule, be recruited from experienced assistants, but few assistants would be willing to undertake the responsibilities of principals if they could do as well from a monetary point of view by remaining assistants.

White Estate in Leitrim.

MR. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the White Estate at Newtownmanor, North Leitrim, having been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners; and whether, having regard to the fact of a large portion of this estate being waste land, he would urge upon the Commissioners the necessity of purchasing this estate in order to enlarge the many small uneconomic holdings in the district.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) This estate is pending for sale in the Court of the Land Judge. The Estates Commissioners have already intimated to the Judge their estimated price for the untenanted land.

Longford Pass Evicted Tenants.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any steps have been taken towards the reinstatement of the evicted tenants on the Langley Estate, Longford Pass, County Tipperary, named respectively Michael Morris, Laurence Duggan, Edmond Kealey, William Bartley, Pat Leahy, James Bartley, Pat Ryan, and Thomas Maher.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have had this estate inspected and the owner is willing to accept their estimated price. Formal proceedings for sale to the Commissioners have been instituted and the Commissioners are about to make a formal offer in compliance with Section 6 of the Irish Land Act, 1903. Until this offer has been accepted the Commissioners will not be in a position to allot the lands.

Knockaderry Evicted Tenant.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any steps to reinstate the widow Browne in the farm from which her husband was evicted about fifteen years ago, known as the Glebe, situate near Knockaderry, in the County of Limerick; whether he is aware that the farm is at present under the representatives, or Commissioners, of the late Established Church, who are paying £1 per week to a caretaker for herding it, without getting any return for the outlay; and will he see that the Estates Commissioners reinstate her without further delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that an advance for the purchase of this holding was made to the late William Brown by the Church Temporalities Commissioners in 1877. Owing to his failure to pay the purchase annuity, Brown was dispossessed in 1894. Since then several attempts to sell the holding have failed. The provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act do not apply to such a case.

Indian Army Charges.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India, with reference to the agreement arrived at between the Secretary of State for India and the Secretary of State for War that an additional payment of £300,000 a year shall be made from 1st May, 1908, from the Indian revenues to cover the cost of the training of troops and other services connected with the maintenance of the British establishments in India, whether the Indian Government recently sent a despatch to the Secretary of State setting forth objections to that arrangement; whether he can state the nature of those objections; whether the Indian Government was consulted or previously apprised of the proposed terms of that agreement before it was concluded; and whether he will lay a copy of the despatch upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) A despatch has been received from the Government of India setting forth certain objections of a detailed and technical character which cannot well be summarised. As I informed the hon. Member, in answer to a Question on 19th October, the arrangement between the Secretary of State for India and the Secretary of State for War was arrived at on the basis of the recommendation of the Romer Committee, on which the Government of India were represented by Lieutenant-General Sir B. Duff, Chief of the Staff in India. I have already stated that the Secretary of State does not think it would be in the public interest to present Papers on the subject.

Irish Railways—Cattle Transit.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he can state the number of adverse reports that have been made to him by his inspectors regarding the indequate loading accommodation and irregular cattle transit of the various Irish railways; and whether he will state what steps he intends to take to act on these reports and remedy the existing state of cattle transit in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) Inspectors of the Department are constantly visiting railway stations to report on the animal transit arrangements. A numerical statement of the nature suggested in the Question would not be of any real value, and might lead to erroneous inferences. The Department are in frequent communication with the railway companies on matters arising out of the inspectors' reports; and by this procedure, coupled with, when necessary, consultation with the railway officials, improvements in the accommodation for animal traffic have been brought about at many stations. At some others improvements are known to be contemplated, while in further instances consideration is pending, and the matter will not be lost sight of by the Department.

Railway Coupling Accidents.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state the number of fatal and non-fatal accidents caused by the coupling and uncoupling of vehicles on the railways of the United Kingdom during each of the months of 1905 and 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The figures are as follows—

Number of Servants of Railway Companies killed and injured whilst engaged in coupling and uncoupling operations in each month of the years 1905 and 1906.

Month.	1905.		1906.	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
January - - - - - -	—	37	1	38
February - - - - - -	3	44	—	50
March - - - - - -	1	66	—	53
April - - - - - - -	—	33	—	43
May - - - - - - -	2	46	1	49
June - - - - - - -	1	38	1	39
July - - - - - - -	2	40	1	46
August - - - - - -	—	36	—	38
September - - - - - -	1	50	1	50
October - - - - - -	—	41	1	60
November - - - - - -	—	48	3	50
December - - - - - -	2	44	—	56
Total - - - -	12	523	9	572

Poor Relief and Pensions.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in the case of a married woman, aged seventy-four, and living with her husband, who is in receipt of 4s. 6d. per week parish relief, 2s. of which is refunded to the guardians by their son, the woman, who has had no parish relief, is entitled to a pension.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) If the relief is given solely for the support of the husband, the wife would not be disqualified. If it is given towards her support as well as that of her husband, she would be.

Hampstead Town Hall.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the recommendation now before the council of the metropolitan borough of Hampstead to expend £192 in furnishing a robing room in the town hall for the mayor; whether this council recently refused to increase the wages of its dustmen, amounting to £162, because the rates of Hampstead are 7s. 2d. in the pound; whether any application has been made by this council to his Board for a grant to help the unemployed in this borough; whether the sanction of the Local Government Board has to be obtained before expending this sum of money on a robing room; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of refusing to sanction it.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that a recommendation was made to the borough council by their works committee, to the effect that a sum of £192 should be spent in adapting and furnishing the existing robing room for use as a mayor's parlour, but that the council referred the matter back to the committee, who now recommend that a sum of £10 should be spent on doing up the robing room. This recommendation will come before the council at their meeting to-day. No sanction on the part of the Local Government Board to the expenditure is necessary. I am informed that the wages of the whole of the staff of the borough council are considered by the council in January of each year, that in 1906 the wages of the dustmen were increased and that no proposal to increase their wages has been before the council since that date. I understand that the borough council are expending a sum of about £3,300 upon work for the unemployed. No application has been made to me for a payment from the grant in respect of this work. The cost is being defrayed by the borough council themselves.

Poor Relief and Pensions.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state whether a man and his wife, aged respectively seventy-seven and seventy-four years, who at present are living with a son who is a humble worker, and who are in receipt of a sum of 4s. 6d. per week through the guardians, such money being contributed by three sons at the rate of 1s. 6d. each per week, are either jointly or individually entitled to the receipt of an old-age pension.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) If in fact relief is given by the guardians for or on account of these poor persons they would both be disqualified for receiving an old-age pension, although the amount of the relief is repaid to the guardians by the sons.

Parliament Buildings.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the First Commissioner of Works if he will say how many rooms in the Houses of Parliament are utilised for all purposes by the Commons, how many by the Peers, and how many by the members of the Press.

(*Answered by Mr. L. Harcourt.*) The Answer is: Peers, 113; Commons, 204; Press, 25.

Assistant Surveyors of Taxes.

MR. CAVE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in September last, while an examination of candidates for the post of Assistant Surveyor of Taxes was actually proceeding, nineteen vacancies in the office were filled by the appointment of candidates who had previously sat for junior appointments in the Admiralty and other offices; whether such appointments were a breach of one of the conditions governing the examination in question, namely, that candidates passing the examination would be appointed to fill such vacancies as might exist at the date of the examination or within six months after its commencement; and whether it is possible, in order to satisfy those who were disappointed by reason of these appointments, to offer to the first nineteen of the candidates who were unsuccessful at the examination the first nineteen vacancies in the office of Assistant Surveyor of Taxes or other equivalent appointments.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I would refer the hon. and learned Member to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 24th ultimo, to the hon. Member for North Fermanagh. I will send him a copy.

H.M.S. "Barfleur."

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what were the dates of the successive appointments of six captains to H.M.S. "Barfleur" and the changing of five crews in the twenty-four months ending 19th March, 1907, as stated to have taken place in the official Answer to a Question on 19th March, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The six captains were: Captain C. H. Adair, appointed 18th February, 1905; Captain Leslie C. Stuart, 4th April, 1905; Captain E. S. Fitzherbert, 10th May, 1905; Captain Claud A. W. Hamilton, 16th November, 1905; Captain Hugh H. D. Tothill, 19th March, 1906; Captain Peyton Hoskyns, 25th February, 1907. The crews were changed on 4th April, 1905; 10th May, 1905; 28th November, 1905; 20th September, 1906; and 5th March, 1907.

Servian Parcels Post.

MR. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): To ask the Postmaster-General whether parcels containing samples of merchandise sent by parcel post to Servia in strict conformity with the regulations are being detained on the Austro-Hungarian frontier by the Austrian postal or customs' officers; if so, whether the latter have any power to open hampers or parcels sent from the London Post Office; whether this is contrary to the International Parcels Post Convention; and what steps do His Majesty's Government propose to take to put an end to such interference with international trade.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No information has reached me as to irregular treatment of articles sent by parcels post to Servia. Direct parcel mails for Servia are not despatched from this office, the parcels being sent in mails for Germany or Austria. The United Kingdom is not a party to the special convention of the Postal Union relating to the parcel post; but the Anglo-Austrian Parcel Post Agreement provides, in the same way as the international convention, that the internal legislation of each country is applicable generally to parcels sent through that country. Parcels for Servia sent from England are therefore liable in the Austrian service to the Austrian regulations.

Schedule A and Rating Valuations.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what is the general proportion between the annual values of properties as adopted for Schedule A of the Income-Tax Acts and the annual values of the same properties as adopted for rating; and whether in any places the same valuations are adopted for both purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) In England and Wales (excluding the Metropolis) the aggregate values for Schedule A are about 10 per cent. in excess of the values for local rating purposes. In the Metropolis and in Scotland and Ireland the valuations for either purpose are practically identical.

Valuation of Securities of the Post Office Savings Bank.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a valuation, at market values, of the securities held against the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank would show a deficiency of approximately £15,000,000; and, if so, has he considered the question of taking measures to charge this deficiency upon the Consolidated Fund, in accordance with the provisions of 26 and 27 Vict., c. 25.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I beg leave to refer to the Answers given to previous Questions of my hon. friend on this subject on 9th and 18th July, 1907, and 24th February last. To those Answers I have nothing to add, except to point out that the Act quoted in the present Question relates to Trustee Savings Banks, not to Post Office Savings Banks, and that Section 7 of the Act, authorising in certain circumstances a charge on the Consolidated Fund, was repealed by Section 15 of the Savings Banks Act, 1904.

Infantry Battalions.

MR. GODFREY BARING (Isle of Wight): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the existing number of battalions of Regular infantry on the Home, Indian, and Colonial establishments, respectively; what are the the peace and war establishments of a battalion in each category; and with this establishment what would be the number of infantry soldiers in the Army Reserve, irrespective of Special Reservists, on 1st January, 1920.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) At the end of the trooping season there will be seventy-four battalions at home, twenty-two in the Colonies and Egypt, and fifty-two in India. The peace establishments (excluding officers) are—

Home	777
Colonies and Egypt	904
India	1,004

and the war establishments are—

Home	979
Colonies and Egypt	979
India	816

These figures are exclusive of the details left at the base, amounting to 104. Assuming that no further changes in establishments and terms of service are made, the Reserve on 1st January, 1920, would be at about the normal, *i.e.*, 63,370.

Military Expenditure of the Great Powers.

MR. MADDISON: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what are the total aggregate amounts which have been devoted to military expenditure during the last ten years (1899–1900 to 1908–9) by Great Britain, Germany, France, and Russia respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)

Great Britain.

Military Expenditure (Army Votes and Loans), 1899–1900 to 1908–9.

—	Peace Expenditure, including Loans.*	War Expenditure.	Total.
	£	£	£
1899–1900	21,317,399	22,790,000	44,107,399
1900–1	27,163,671	65,261,000	92,424,671
1901–2	30,033,605	64,132,300	94,165,905
1902–3	30,101,623	40,146,900	70,248,523
1903–4	34,411,334	5,241,700	39,653,034
1904–5	31,147,183	412,455	31,559,638
1905–6	29,129,574	—	29,129,574
1906–7	28,365,987	—	28,365,987
1907–8 (Estimate)	27,326,718	—	27,326,718
1908–9 (Estimate)	27,109,101	—	27,109,101

* *i.e.*, Loan expenditure and interest on loans.

Germany.

Military Expenditure for 1899-1900 to 1908–9.

(Includes the Votes for Military Administration, Pensions, Tribunals, East Asian Detachment, and Colonial Forces.)

Year.	Estimates.
	£
1899–1900	36,348,438*
1900–1	37,887,872
1901–2	44,522,011
1902–3	40,833,306
1903–4	38,818,105
1904–5	42,736,259
1905–6	45,013,226
1906–7	49 881,790
1907–8	49,297,331
1908–9	51,437,636

* Colonial Estimates not shown here, not being available.

France.

Military Expenditure, 1899–1900 to 1908–9.

—	Army.*	Colonial Military Expenditure.†
	£	£
1899–1900 - - - -	26,576,673	3,146,006
1900–1 - - - - -	26,931,262	3,899,769
1901–2 - - - - -	29,173,398	4,007,746
1902–3 - - - - -	29,268,464	3,512,854
1903–4 - - - - -	28,248,826	3,283,243
1904–5 - - - - -	28,096,753	3,330,935
1905–6 - - - - -	27,393,379	3,723,077
1906–7 - - - - -	28,747,635	3,716,906
1907–8 - - - - -	31,199,445	3,678,061
1908–9 - - - - -	31,195,004	3,172,294

* In addition to above expenditure on Army £92,763,947 were expended on improvement of armament between 1898 and 1906.

† Does not include the cost of that portion of the Colonial Army which is stationed in France; this is included in the Army Budget.

The Colonies contribute annually about £500,000 towards the Colonial military expenditure.

Russia.

Military Expenditure, 1899–1909.

(Exclusive of Expenditure in connection with Russo-Japanese War.)

	£
1899 - - -	36,483,000
1900 - - -	36,838,000
1901 - - -	36,067,000
1902 - - -	35,849,000
1903 - - -	36,647,000
1904 - - -	38,380,000
1905 - - -	38,841,784
1906 - - -	39,677,880
1907 - - -	41,887,977
1908 (Estimate) -	50,227,935
1909 (Estimate) -	57,343,855

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Contract for Protected Cruisers.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether all the orders for protected cruisers of the improved "Boadicea" type which the Government intend placing at this time have now been placed; if so, will he say how many have been ordered from Clyde shipbuilders; are these vessels to be fitted with Yarrow or with Babcock boilers; and will he state the comparative merits of the type of boiler chosen.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The reply to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. Three of the vessels ordered are to be built on the Clyde. The ships will be fitted with Yarrow boilers. It is not desirable to make such a statement as is suggested in the last part of the Question.

Unarmoured Cruiser Contracts.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the order for the fifth cruiser has been placed; and, if not, will he again consider the claim of London and place it on the Thames to be built.

Mr. McKENNA: All the six unarmoured cruisers of this year's programme have been ordered. Five have been placed with private firms, and the sixth was laid down last June at Pembroke.

Anti-Torpedo Destroyer Armaments.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Admiralty propose taking steps to improve the anti-torpedo destroyer armament on His Majesty's ships "Natal," "Achilles," "Cochrane," and "Warrior."

Mr. McKENNA: The Admiralty do not propose to make any change.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the armaments of these vessels are 9·2 and 7·1, and that they are incapable of rapid action?

Mr. McKENNA: I am aware of that.

The New Destroyers.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state definitely the size, horse-power, anticipated speed, and armament of the sixteen destroyers of the 1908–9 programme; and to state the size, horse-power, speed, and armament of the "Tribal" destroyers.

Mr. McKENNA: The figures for the sixteen destroyers of the 1908–9 programme are: Displacement, 930–1,030 tons; speed, 27 knots; armament, 5–12-pounder guns, two torpedo tubes. Those for the early "Tribal" destroyers are: Displacement, 950–975 tons; speed, 33 knots; armament, 3–12-pounder guns, two torpedo tubes. Those for the later "Tribal" destroyers are: Displacement, 1,050–1,100 tons; speed, 33 knots; armament, 2–4-inch guns, two torpedo tubes. The figures with regard to the displacement of the later "Tribal" class and the new programme destroyers, and the speed of the latter, are estimates only. The estimated horse-power for the 27-knot destroyers is 12,000, the contract conditions for the "Tribal" destroyers did not provide for the horse-power to be measured, and no official record of the power on contractors' trial was obtained.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE: I thank the right hon. Gentleman for this very full information.

Trials of New Destroyers.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the negotiations have now been completed for the purchase of the two destroyers to replace the lost "Gala" and "Tiger," and, if so, can he give particulars of their dimensions, their speed, and their names.

Mr. McKENNA: The negotiations referred to have not been completed.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE: When are they likely to be completed? I first asked this Question seventeen days ago.

Mr. McKENNA: The negotiations have been protracted because the trials have not been quite satisfactory. That is not the fault of the Admiralty, of course.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE: Does the right hon. Gentleman expect to be in a position to give the information before the end of the present session?

Mr. McKENNA: It does not depend on me.

Admiralty Contracts.

Mr. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will have printed with the Votes the names of the firms that contracted for the cruisers and destroyers; and the amount of each tender.

Mr. McKENNA: The tenders for the cruisers and destroyers have only been provisionally accepted, and the tender prices cannot, therefore, be given. It is not in accordance with usual practice to publish in the Navy Estimates the total cost of ships during the first year of their construction, and therefore it would be undesirable to give this information in another form.

In reply to Mr. CURRAN (Jarrow),

MR. McKENNA said the orders had been allocated with due regard to the interests of the Navy, the prices tendered, and the desirability of distributing the work. It was not the custom to place orders without regard to cost.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham): Are the lowest tenders accepted?

MR. McKENNA: Yes, so far as is consistent with the other considerations I have mentioned.

MR. CURRAN: Do the Admiralty also investigate whether the firms tendering pay trade union rates of wages?

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

Dockyard Employees.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can give the number of men employed in the dockyards and victualling yards, casually and permanently, during the last weeks in November, 1898, and the last week in 1908; and whether all the permanent men are entitled to pensions as a condition of their employment.

MR. McKENNA: The number of men employed in the Home Dockyards at the end of November, 1898 and 1908, were as follows:—

Yard.	Week ended 19th November, 1898.	Week ended 21st November, 1908.
Portsmouth - - - - -	8,268	10,609
Devonport - - - - -	6,879	8,999
Chatham - - - - -	6,770	8,767
Sheerness - - - - -	2,045	2,031
Pembroke - - - - -	2,495	2,064
West India Docks - - -	235	217
Haulbowline - - - - -	217	792
Total - - -	26,909	33,479

The only men who would be entitled to pension are those on the established list.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS pointed out that the right hon. Gentleman had not stated how many of the hands were on the established list, neither had he given the figures for certain victualling yards.

MR. McKENNA: I regret I am unable to give the information.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): How far is the right hon. Gentleman's Answer consistent with the undertaking of Ministers to reduce the extravagant expenditure on our armaments?

[No Answer was returned.]

Anarchist Outrages in India.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can inform the House what action has been taken upon representations by the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, the Calcutta Trades Association, and the European Anglo-Indian

Defence Association, urging upon the Government of India the necessity for the immediate establishment of a special tribunal of High Court Judges to deal summarily with all persons convicted of Anarchist outrages, and recommending certain additions to the existing laws of British India in order to the suppression of sedition.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): Tho whole subject is being considered with the care that it demands. The Secretary of State is unable at present to say anything further.

Tampering with Indian Native Troops.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether a Brahmin was lately charged at Jhansi with tampering with the loyalty of the native troops at that station; and, if the answer be in the affirmative, whether the accused was convicted; and, if so, what punishment was inflicted.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has seen in the newspapers the report of such a case, in which the accused was ordered to find sureties for good behaviour, but he has no official information on the subject.

MR. REES asked whether the Secretary of State would cause inquiry to be made with a view of taking due notice of the conduct of a magistrate who awarded so trivial a punishment for so heinous an offence as suborning troops to treason.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Will the Under-Secretary also undertake to inquire as to the nature of the evidence?

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that all these troubles have come upon India since the Member for Montgomery Boroughs left; and whether he will consider the advisability of sending him back again?

Mr. REES rose to put a further Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. BUCHANAN: It is not in our power to take that drastic action to which allusion has been made. It would be, I think, very unwise now to express any opinion upon this case, when we are not in possession of the details of the evidence; but I might point out that, after all, it is a serious offence with which this man was charged—namely, actively tampering with the Sepoys, and that he was turned out of the cantonment with contumely by a native officer.

MR. REES: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether he will advise the hon. Member——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order

Indian Army Pay.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the increased rates of pay for the Indian Army foreshadowed in the King's Message will apply to all ranks and to the British officers serving in that force as well.

MR. BUCHANAN: The precise nature of the increase of pay referred to in the King's Message will very shortly be announced by the Government of India, and the Secretary of State is unable to make any statement at present.

MR. ASHLEY: Will the increase apply to all ranks?

MR. BUCHANAN: I am unable to make any statement on the subject.

Indian Army Charges.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India has protested against the increase of £300,000 a year to the Home charges of the Indian Army; and whether, if so, the despatch embodying their objections will be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. As I stated on a former occasion, the Secretary of State has decided not to lay the Report of the Romer Committee before the House, and the Government of India's despatch could not be presented separately.

South Nigerian Expedition.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, with the intention of opening up the whole of the hitherto unexplored regions of South Nigeria, a force of 800 men will start operations under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Trenchard, D.S.O., in a few weeks, and that the work of bringing the districts under control is expected to last six or seven months; whether he can give any account of this projected expedition and the arms and ammunition with which the explorers will be equipped; and whether he can say in how many small wars against native tribes this country is at present engaged, and why this intended expedition has not been communicated to Parliament.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercrombv): As I explained in the Answer which I gave to my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean on 24th November, no military expedition is contemplated; I then explained the action which is being taken in the territory in question.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Perhaps the Secretary of State will answer the last part of my Question as to how many small wars against natives tribes this country is at present engaged in?

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): It does not apply to my office.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Small wars do apply to your office. I am speaking with reference to the Soudan expedition and others, of which this Parliament has been kept in ignorance.

Sir EDWARD GREY: If the hon. Gentleman wishes to put Questions on any particular points, I shall be glad to answer them, but I cannot answer general Questions.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: That is very good of you.

Boycotting of British Indians in the Transvaal.

Dr. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that British-Indian traders are being systematically boycotted by their white rivals in the Transvaal, the boycott extending to Dutch farmers who prefer to deal with Indians in preference to European traders; and whether the Secretary of State proposes to take any action in the matter.

Colonel SEELY: No, Sir, the Secretary of State has no official information of any such boycott as that described in the Question.

Colonial Immigration Regulation.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information showing the practice in the various British Dominions as to sums of money required to be possessed by immigrants; and whether there is any preference or relaxation in favour of emigrants from the United Kingdom.

Colonel SEELY: Information on the subject of the sum which emigrants are required to possess before entering the Colonies was given in my reply on 24th November to a Question put by my hon. friend the Member for the Cirencester division. So far as I know, there is no preference or relaxation in favour of emigrants from the United Kingdom.

Sleeping Sickness in Horses.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the alleged discovery of a successful treatment for sleeping sickness in horses; whether he has any information as to the details of a case at Sierra Leone in which this treatment is alleged to have been successful; and whether, in view of the importance of the subject, he will endeavour to secure that the matter shall receive careful investigation.

Colonel SEELY: The attention of scientific men in this country and elsewhere is being continually directed to this matter, but the Secretary of State is advised that no successful treatment for trypanosomiasis in horses has yet been discovered. We are in possession of information which leads us to believe that there is a form of trypanosomiasis affecting animals in the neighbouring Colonies to Sierra Leone from which they may recover without any treatment. If, however, the hon. Gentleman will forward me the information on which he relies, we shall be glad to investigate the matter fully.

British-Indians and Transvaal Registration Laws.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many British-Indians of all classes have been imprisoned with and without hard labour for offences against the registration laws of the Transvaal since February last; and whether any more protests have been received from India in the matter.

COLONEL SEELY: I am not in a position to give the figures required, but inquiry shall be made of the Governor. The answer to the last paragraph is in the affirmative.

MR. REES: Do not the British-Indians place themselves in this position voluntarily?

COLONEL SEELY: That is a very nice question as to their actual position.

DR. RUTHERFORD: May I ask whether the harsh treatment meted out to British-Indians in South Africa is not creating great indignation in India?

COLONEL SEELY: I do not think it would be wise to make any general statement. It is a difficult situation.

MR. LUPTON: Would the condition of these Indians be better if India was not under the British Government?

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir; certainly not.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Hira Mulji, a boy of twelve, who was recently sentenced to fourteen days imprisonment for entering the Transvaal with his father, and subsequently sentenced to a further month's imprisonment for the same offence; and whether he proposes to take any steps in this matter, and to prevent the further imprisonment of British-Indian children in like circumstances.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir. Inquiry shall be made into the facts.

Hong Kong Riots.

MR. ROBINSON (Brecknock): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has any information regarding the banishment without trial of the manager and editor of a Chinese newspaper and five prominent Chinese merchants from Hong-Kong; and if he is able to state to the House the nature of the offence for which they have been deported.

COLONEL SEELY: The Governor has informed the Secretary of State by telegram that in consequence of the riots of 2nd November, he used the authority of the local laws to banish three persons not British subjects. The action was taken after careful inquiry in accordance with the advice of the Executive Council. The men are stated to be leaders of the movement for a Japanese boycott which culminated in local disturbances and outrages.

MR. ROBINSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can give any information regarding the anti-Japanese riots which have occurred in Hong Kong during the last two or three weeks.

COLONEL SEELY: I am afraid that I cannot give my hon. friend any further information on this subject beyond that contained in the telegram to which I referred when answering his last Question.

British-Indians in the Transvaal.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the case of four British-Indian boys who were punished as prohibited immigrants for entering the Transvaal with their parents, three to a fine of £15 or two months imprisonment and one to a fine of £5 or fourteen days hard labour; whether he is aware that three of the boys were ten, eleven, and twelve years of age and that they were all sent to gaol; and whether he can state the number of British-Indian children that have been sent to gaol for a similar offence.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir, but inquiry shall be made.

Shanghai Opium Conference.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British representatives to the Opium Conference in Shanghai are already in possession of strong views on the subjects to be discussed, and have committed themselves to these views in public; and, if so, will he say what useful purpose can be served by a Conference in the East if there is no member open to conversion.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware how far any of the British representatives have expressed themselves publicly on the subjects to be discussed at the Opium Conference; but as British delegates they will be guided at the Conference by the instructions which they will receive from His Majesty's Government, due regard being had to the state of facts brought as a whole before the Conference.

Disturbances in Hayti.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to give any further information as to the cause of the disturbances in Hayti, and the position of British subjects there.

SIR EDWARD GREY: No details as to the course of the present revolution in Hayti have been received by His Majesty's Government of later date than 30th November, when the insurgents were reported to be marching on the capital. No confirmation has been received of the reports in the Press that Port-au-Prince is now in the hands of the revolutionaries. H.M.S. "Scylla," was ordered on 30th November to proceed from St. Lucia to Port-au-Prince, where she was expected to arrive on the 2nd instant. The "Scylla" will, of course, give protection, if it is required, for British subjects in Hayti.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Has the right hon. Gentleman any information as to whether any troops have been landed there from the ships of any other Powers?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No, Sir. I have not heard that any troops have been landed except the crews of two American war vessels which have been there for some days.

The Lado Enclave.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the wholesale destruction of the elephants in the Lado enclave will give rise to claim for waste and damage to that territory on the termination of the lease to His Majesty the King of the Belgians.

SIR EDWARD GREY: In the event of any proceedings which are likely to injure the leased territory permanently, representations will be made at Brussels.

Destruction of African Wild Game.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Soudan Government have made regulations respecting the destruction of wild game in the Soudan; and if that Government can prevent the export through the Soudan of the proceeds of unauthorised destruction of such game in territories at present outside the Soudan but coming within the provisions of the International African Game Convention.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Government of the Soudan have issued regulations for carrying out the stipulations of the International Game Convention of 19th May, 1900. I am not aware whether the Government of the Soudan possess the power referred to in the second paragraph of the Question, but I will make inquiries.

MR. FELL: If the Government of the Soudan has power to carry out the Convention, would it not follow that it has the power suggested in the Question?

SIR EDWARD GREY: That is what I wish to ask about.

Colonel Liakhoff's Position at Teheran.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to a statement recently made by the Russian Minister in Teheran to the effect that Colonel Liakhoff had been acting under the orders of the Russian Minister of War, directions being sent to him by the military government of the Caucasus; and whether he is now prepared to modify the Answer given to the hon. Member for the Ripon division, and repeated in effect on subsequent occasions, that this Russian officer in Persian employ was acting independently of the Russian Government.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have noticed the report in the Press of an alleged interview with the Russian Minister in Teheran; but even if the statements imputed to the latter are authentic I see no reason to modify the reply given to the hon. Member with regard to Colonel Liakhoff's action in the *coup d'etat* in the summer.

British Ports.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can furnish information, in a tabular form, for purposes of comparison, showing the increase in the last twenty years of the numbers, tonnage, and draft of individual ships making use of the Port of London and of the other principal British and Continental ports, differentiating steam and sailing ships.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper in the name of the hon. Gentleman:—

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can lay before the House of Commons proposals made by local bodies in England for improving in the near future waterways, harbours, and docks for the better accommodation of ships of large size and of heavy draft, showing the amount of expenditure proposed and the objects for which the expenditure is intended; and similar information respecting the proposed improvements to be undertaken either by central or local governments in the rivers, ports, and docks of Continental countries.

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can furnish to the House of Commons in a tabular form statistics showing the expenditure during recent years on the principal ports and docks, including the Port of London, at home, and on the Continent of Europe, and the result of such expenditure in regard to the increase of accommodation for ships, whether in docks or alongside of quays, or in deepening waterways; whether further information can be given showing the depths at high and low tide during spring and neap tides at the entrances to the various docks situated on the River Thames, and of the shallower parts of the waterways leading to those docks; and whether, for the purposes of comparison, similar information can be given in regard to the chief Continental rivers, ports and docks.

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any record is kept of the demurrage caused to ships of heavy draft making use of the Port of London by reason of shallow waterways in the River Thames at low tide; if so, whether he will give to the House of Commons information showing to what extent demurrage has occurred during recent years; and, if there is no such record, will it be possible to take steps for keeping such a record in future.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): If my hon. friend after conferring with the officials at the Board of Trade will move for a Return giving in a suitable form such of the desired particulars as can be furnished or readily obtained by the Department, I will endeavour to meet his wishes so far as practicable, but I ought to warn him that the work of the Department is very heavy at this season of the year, that the preparation of such a Return will take a considerable time, and that it could not possibly be ready during the present session. Meanwhile he will find a good deal of information bearing on the subjects in which he is interested in certain publications of which I am sending him a list.

Political Contributions by Railway Companies.

MR. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the contribution of railway companies for 1907 to ratepayers' associations and muncipal alliances amounting to £336 19s. 9d., to labour protection associations £35, to the free labour association £341 13s.; and whether he intends to take action, under Section 17 of the Act of 1844, to restrain these companies from making these contributions.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am aware that the amounts mentioned by the hon. Member were contributed by certain railway companies during 1907, but I do not think that I could usefully take any action in the matter under the statutory provi ion referred to.

Illegal Insurance Policies.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade with reference to the Circulars which he recently issued to insurance companies and friendly societies on the subject of illegal policies, whether he has received any assurances from any of the companies or societies that the practices complained of have been definitely abandoned, or whether he has reason to believe that the warning has been absolutely ignored.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Circular issued by the Board of Trade to insurance companies did not ask for a reply, but replies have been received from a large number of companies. From the nature of these replies I may say that the companies either intimated that their practice was in accordance with the views expressed in the Circular, or that their agents would be instructed in the terms thereof, or that due consideration would be given thereto. As regards the Circular issued by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies to friendly collecting societies I am informed that the societies generally have warned their collectors not to issue policies which are not in accordance with law.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Has it not come to the knowledge of the Board of Trade officials that the companies chiefly complained of are to-day still carrying on the very practice of issuing policies on lives in which the person paying has no insurable interest?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir.

Port of Liverpool.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any record is kept of the demurrage caused to ships of heavy draft making use of the Port of Liverpool by reason of shallow waterways in the River Mersey at low tide; if so, whether he will give to the House of Commons information showing to what extent demurrage has occurred during recent years; and, if there is no such record, will it be possible to take steps for keeping such a record in future.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board inform me that they have not received any complaints that ships of heavy draft have been delayed in the Port of Liverpool owing to insufficient depth of water. They think it can hardly be said that there are any shallow waterways in the River Mersey at Liverpool, inasmuch as since 1890 the Dock Board have dredged the Mersey Bar so that now there are twenty-eight to twenty-nine feet of water at low water of ordinary spring tides, while in the anchorage ground between the Seaforth Battery to the north and Rock Ferry Pier to the south there is a depth of from forty to seventy-eight feet at low water of ordinary spring tides. In these circumstances the necessity for keeping such a record hardly appears to arise.

North Ronaldshay Lighthouse.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has received the account of the total wreck of the "Isle of Erin," and the loss of many valuable lives, given by the lighthouse-keeper, North Ronaldshay, Orkney, suggesting that if there had been telegraphic communication the ship and crew might have been saved; and if, in view of the fact that no portion of His Majesty's Dominions containing such a population is so disadvantageously situated as regards communication with the outside world, he will confer with the Post Office and Scottish Office with the object of extending the telegraph to North Ronaldshay.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have seen a newspaper extract containing a letter sent to the owner of this vessel by the lighthouse-keeper at North Ronaldshay, and I have received a letter from the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses urging the desirability of telegraphic communication between the island and the mainland. I have ordered an inquiry into the circumstances which attended the presumed loss of the vessel, and the lack of such communication will, no doubt, form one of the points to which the attention of the Court will be directed. His Majesty's Government will give their most careful consideration to any recommendation which may be made by the Court as well as to that of the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses.

Colonial Tariffs.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is able to state what fiscal advantages are now given in the Colonial possessions of France, Germany, Spain, the Netherlands, and the United States to goods imported from the Mother Country over goods imported from foreign countries, and what advantages are in return conceded by the same countries to goods imported from their own Colonies instead of from other countries; and if he will cause a Return to be prepared on this subject, in continuation of Commercial Paper, No. 5, of Session 1895.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would refer the hon. Member to Memorandum No. XI., included in the first volume of Memoranda relating to British and Foreign Trade and Industrial Conditions (Cd. 1761 of 1903). The only change in this matter which has since taken place is in regard to the treatment in Spain of the products of Fernando Po and other Spanish possessions in Africa and *vice versa*. The list of articles the produce of these Colonies which are exempted from duty on importation into Spain has been somewhat extended whilst Spanish goods imported into these Colonies now enjoy preferential treatment only if imported under the Spanish flag. If the hon. Member, after considering the information given in the Memorandum referred to, requires fuller details on the subject, and will move for a Return, I will see what can be done to furnish him with the information he desires.

British Magazines for Canada.

Mr. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can give any figures to show the increase in the postage of British magazines to Canada since the reduction in the postal rate in such articles.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I am glad to say that the Canadian magazine post instituted last May is fully realising the objects for which it was instituted. It has lead to a remarkable increase in the number of British magazines, periodicals, and trade journals sent from the United Kingdom to Canada. It is estimated that the increase in the yearly number of British publications sent to the Dominion is some six millions per annum. I am, moreover, informed, on good authority, that the increase has been greatest in the case of magazines of high class. This is, I think, not the least satisfactory feature of the new post.

Christmas Pay in the Post Office.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the men employed at the Post Offices of Leicester, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Birkenhead to meet the Christmas pressure are, under the new order he has issued, to be paid less per hour than in former years; and whether he would state the pay this year and that of last year at these offices.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I beg to refer my hon. friend to my Answer to his Question on the 23rd ultimo with regard to the general basis upon which the rates for the Christmas casual force in the different districts have been fixed. In most cases the payments are increased. I am sending him a statement of the rates paid in 1907, and those to be paid this year at the particular offices to which he refers.

Telephone Communication in Gloucestershire.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the inhabitants of Naunton, Upper Slaughter, and Lower Slaughter, and the surrounding country in the County of Gloucester, are wholly without telegraphic communication; whether he will at once proceed to give such facilities to these districts; and whether, if he gives such communication, he will consult the local councils as to the routes to be chosen for his wires so as to to do as little hurt to the beauty of these places as may be.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have recently authorised an extension of the telegraph system to the village of Upper Slaughter, which is only about three-quarters of a mile from Lower Slaughter. Telegraph offices at both villages would not be warranted, and Upper Slaughter appears to be the better centre. A local landowner and the local authorities concerned have granted the wayleave required, so that I may assume that the route chosen is satisfactory to them. A telegraph office at Naunton was offered under guarantee three years ago, and I am prepared to renew the offer if desired.

The New Education Bill.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been drawn to the case of the teachers likely to lose their situations under the system of transfers proposed in the Education Bill; and whether, in view of the limited powers of private Members with regard to any Amendment suitable to this case, he will cause to be put down on behalf of the Government an Amendment or new clause, such as will give the House an opportunity of doing justice in the matter before the Committee stage is closed.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. It is impossible to say what is covered by the sentence in the right hon. Gentleman's Question, "teachers likely to lose their situations under the system of transfers proposed in the Education Bill." But I am considering carefully some proposals which have been presented to me on behalf of the teachers, and I will be in a position to make a statement on the matter on Clause 8 or on some other suitable occasion.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the exception at the end of subsection (3) of Clause 1 of the Education (No. 2) Bill applies to the case of a prosecution under bye-laws of the local education authority, or whether it applies only to the case of an attendance order under Sections 4 and 11 of the Elementary Education Act, 1876.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The exception (with respect to the schools selected by the parent) applies only to attendance orders, and is not applicable to prosecutions under bye-laws.

Co-operative Societies and Small Holdings.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he will state the extent of the land which each of the four co-operative societies has acquired from the county councils; and whether the land so acquired is by purchase or hire; if the latter, for how many years is the land hired, if the former, what price per acre have the societies agreed to pay.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury: for Sir EDWARD STRACHEY): The following table gives the information for which the right hon. Member asks—

County.	Co-operative Society.	Area of land let to the Society.			Terms of lease under which the Society have hired the land.	Average rent per acre agreed to be paid by the Society.	
		a.	r.	p.	Years.	s.	d.
Bedfordshire	Biggleswade	271	1	19	21	31	3
Northants -	Clipston -	107	–	–	7	27	–
" -	Rushden -	264	–	–	14	21	6
Wiltshire -	Mere - -	443	3	24	21	18	–

English Agricultural Grant.

MR. ESSEX: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what is the total sum allocated by the Board of Agriculture from the last Vote for the promotion of the interests of English agriculture.

MR. FULLER: Of the net expenditure of the Board during the year ended 31st March, 1908, the amount allocated to England and Wales was approximately £123,000, of which about £8,000 was expended on matters connected with the fishing industry.

American Gooseberry Mildew.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether there have been outbreaks of American gooseberry-mildew notified from Sussex and Bedfordshire; and, if so, whether the Board intend to issue an order scheduling these counties under the Insect Pests Act.

MR. FULLER: An outbreak of American gooseberry-mildew has been discovered by one of the Board's inspectors in Sussex. As the occupier of the premises is adopting the measures required by the Board, and as this disease does not spread during the winter months, a special order for the county is unnecessary for the present. The Board have no official information as to an outbreak in Bedfordshire.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): What grounds have the Board for saying the disease does not spread during the winter months?

MR. FULLER: I will inquire.

Inspectors under the Insects and Pests Act.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many counties have appointed inspectors, and in what numbers, under the Insects and Pests Act; and whether, in all cases of such appointments, efficient expert inspectors have been selected.

MR. FULLER: According to the information of the Board one expert inspector has been appointed by each of the following local authorities:—Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Herefordshire, Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Derbyshire, Norfolk, the Isle of Ely, Huntingdonshire, Cambridgeshire, and two by the Kent County Council. In Essex no expert inspector has, so far as the Board are aware, been appointed, but police officers have been appointed to carry out the work.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: Who looks after the inspection in the counties of Surrey and Sussex?

MR. FULLER: I will inquire.

Carnarvon Farmers' Association.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in reply to an application from the Carnarvon Farmers' Association for a grant for the purpose of improving the breed of cattle, the Board informed them that they had no fund for the purpose; and whether, in view of the fact that the country's meat supply now depends largely on foreign cattle, the Board will reconsider the question.

MR. FULLER: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Board as at present advised are not satisfied that any action on the lines suggested is necessary.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): Are there any funds available for the improvement of cattle-breeding either in this country or in Ireland?

MR. FULLER: I cannot say.

MR. WATT: Will the hon. Gentleman introduce legislation in order to provide funds?

MR. FULLER: No, Sir, I can make no such promise.

The Spraying of Fruit Trees.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board of Agriculture will issue a leaflet dealing with the regulations for the spraying of fruit-trees now in force in British Columbia and with the mixtures used for spraying in that country.

MR. FULLER: The Board have issued numerous leaflets dealing with the spraying of fruit crops but they do not think that any useful purpose would be served by the issue of one on the lines suggested, and they are not able, therefore, to adopt the hon. Member's suggestion.

MR. COURTHOPE: Are the Board aware that in British Columbia the growers years ago gave up the system recommended now?

MR. FULLER: The hon. Gentleman must remember the difficulty arising from the difference of climatic conditions.

Fruit Tree Pests.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board have considered or will consider the regulations enforced in British Columbia and other fruit-growing Colonies for the destruction and prevention of fungus and insect pests, with a view to adopting similar regulations in this country.

MR. FULLER: The Board have carefully studied the regulations to which the hon. Member refers. In preparing regulations suited to the particular conditions of this country it is their practice to make such use as may seem desirable of regulations based upon the experience of other countries.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Small Holdings.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Crewe Division, as Ecclesiastical Commissioner, whether the first offer of all vacant farms the property of the Commissioners will, in future, be given to the small holdings committee of the county in which they are situate.

MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): The Commissioners' practice has been and is to endeavour to utilise for small holdings and allotments all vacant farms which in their opinion are at all suitable for that purpose. They have also, since the Act, endeavoured by arrangement with their tenants to provide land when it is required for small holdings or allotments in localities where they have no vacant farms. A large number of small holdings and allotments have been and are being thus provided, in some cases by lettings to county and parish councils, and in others by direct lettings to the applicants.

MR. ROGERS: What proportion of the quarter-million acres owned by the Commissioners has been dealt with in this way ?

Mr. TOMKINSON: I cannot reply to that definitely, but I can inform the hon. Member that in and since 1906, forty-seven new lettings have been effected for small holdings and allotments comprising 1,606 acres upon the Commissioners' estates, the tenants being in twenty cases local authorities, and in the remaining twenty-seven cases individual tenants or bodies of tenants, in some cases very numerous. In addition there are now under consideration twenty-seven offers of, or applications which they expect to satisfy for land for the same purposes amounting to 1,430 acres. Quite recently 87 a. 1r. 31p. of land at Tarvin (Cheshire) has been sold by the Commissioners to the Cheshire County Council for this purpose.

Mr. WINFREY (Norfolk, S.W.): And in how many cases has there been an increase of rents to small holders as compared with previous rents ?

Mr. TOMKINSON: I must have notice of that Question. Personally, I have no knowledge of any case.

Sheriff-Substitutes

Mr. WATT: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will say how many solicitors have been appointed in Scotland to the positions of sheriff-substitutes; during how many years has it been open to solicitors to be so appointed; and whether in view of the facts that solicitors are drawn from all classes of society and are many in number, whereas advocates are drawn from the wealthy classes and are few in number, he will in future appointments give preference to the solicitor's branch of the profession.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick, Burghs): As the office of sheriff-substitute has been open to all branches of the legal profession since the year 1825, when a legal qualification was first required and appointments to the office were for over fifty years made by the sheriffs-depute, I cannot give my hon. friend the information he desires in the first part of the Question. As regards the latter part I do not think it would be in the interests of the public service to discriminate between branches of the legal profession in the sense suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. WATT: Has the right hon. Gentleman appointed any solicitors to these posts since he has been in office, and will he in future see that the solicitors, who constitute the larger branch of the service, get their proper share ?

Mr. THOMAS SHAW: The Answer to the next Question covers that, I think.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he can say how many appointments to the office of sheriff-substitute have been made since the nominations to such office rested with him; and if he will give the names and callings of those so appointed and the places of appointment.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW: In the period referred to there have been six such appointments. Of those appointed one was an advocate and King's Counsel, the other five were advocates. If my hon. friend desires it I shall be glad to furnish him with a list of the names of the gentlemen appointed, the dates of appointment and the sheriff-substituteships referred to.

Depute Sheriff Clerks.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that, at a meeting on the 4th instant, the sheriffs-principal of Scotland were unanimously of opinion that better provision should be made in regard to the tenure of office, appointment, and remuneration of depute sheriff clerks; whether he will deal with the matter in the Summary Jurisdiction Bill; and, if not, what steps he proposes taking in order to secure to depute sheriff clerks an improvement and more certain permanency in their official appointments.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW: An excerpt from a minute of meeting of the sheriffs of Scotland has been sent to me. It contains a number of suggestions with regard to the deputes to the sheriff clerks, very justly distinguishing between their various positions and, while generally favouring better provision, suggests guarantees as to suitability, criticises the depute sheriff clerks' proposals and indicates that safeguards might be provided by the approval of the sheriffs themselves. The matter is not within the scope of the Summary Jurisdiction Bill. There is a likelihood of a Commission or Committee being appointed to consider various points as to minor legal appointments in Scotland and I am favourably disposed to have this matter, including the suggestions made by the sheriffs, some of which are novel, brought into the scope of the inquiry.

Dunleer Allotments.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Estates Commissioners fixed 1st November last as the date on which they would announce to whom allotments would be made of land in their hands for that purpose in Dunleer, County Louth, and that so far nothing has been done; whether he is aware that discontent exists in the neighbourhood on account of the delay; and whether he will hasten the allocation of allotments, and take steps to ensure that no preferential treatment is accorded to nominees of the United Irish League.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that they did not fix 1st November as the date for the allotment of these lands. The allotment will be made when the Commissioners have completed their arrangements for the resale of the lands.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer that part of the Question which deals with the preferential treatment accorded to nominees of the United Irish League?

MR. BIRRELL: No such preferential treatment is ever accorded.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Since when has that been the regulation?

MR. BIRRELL: From the beginning.

Mearscourt Estate, Westmeath.

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have as yet compulsorily acquired, under the Evicted Tenants Act, that portion of the lands of Mearscourt, near Mayvore, County Westmeath, of which public notice was given on 15th August; and, if so, when Mrs. Wynn and Mrs. Winkel, the tenants evicted from that land, are likely to be reinstated.

MR. BIRRELL: The lands on the estate of General Devenish Meares, which the Estates Commissioners propose to acquire compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act, have been inspected, and the Commissioners hope to be in a position to make an offer for them at an early date. The Commissioners are not in a position, at this stage of the proceedings, to say when the lands will be acquired or the evicted tenants reinstated.

State Purchase of Irish Railways.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has asked Mr. Gerald Balfour if, when Chief Secretary for Ireland, he asked Mr. Thomas Robertson, then Chairman of the Board of Works (Ireland), for estimates, first of the cost of purchase of the railways of Ireland by the State, and, secondly, of the cost of guaranteeing dividends by an arrangement securing the control of the Government; and, if so, whether he can state the estimate in each case.

MR. BIRRELL: As I have already stated, there is no record, either in the Irish Office or in the Office of Public Works, of any such estimate having been asked for or received. If Mr. Gerald Balfour received such an estimate, he must, I presume, have obtained it for his personal information. I do not think it would be regular that I should address any inquiries on the subject to Mr. Balfour. I will, however, send him a copy of this Answer.

Fuge Estate, Cork.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates

Commissioners have yet made any definite offer of purchase of the untenanted lands of Garryduff and Gurrane on the Fuge estate near Kilbrin, County Cork, and for the purchase of the demesne lands at Templemary, near Buttevant, with a view to the reinstatement of evicted tenants and the enlargement of uneconomic holdings, if so, with what result; and whether, in the event of the acquisition of these lands or portion thereof, the Commissioners will take all possible steps to give a preference in the occupation thereof to the families who formerly occupied and tilled them or to their representatives.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have published in the *Dublin Gazette* a notice of their intention to acquire the lands of Garryduff and Gurrane compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act, and have had the lands inspected with a view to making an offer for them. If acquired, the lands will be utilised to provide holdings for the classes of persons mentioned in the Act. No formal proceedings are pending before the Commissioners with regard to the demesne lands at Templemary, but the Commissioners have had an inspection made, and will intimate to the owner the price which they are prepared to advance if proceedings for sale are instituted. It is not possible to make any statement, at this stage, as regards the allotment of these lands if acquired.

Edenderry Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the case of the application of two labourers for a house and acre and an additional half-acre in No. 3 district council of Edenderry by Mr. Hope and Mr. Durgnan, being granted by the inspector, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and the landlord, Mr. Langan, having appealed to the Local Government Board, a second inquiry was held by another inspector, Mr. Kelly, who decided against the applications; on what grounds was Mr. Kelly's decision upheld and Mr. Fitzpatrick's rejected; and how much land has Mr. Langan in his possession.

MR. BIRRELL: The facts are as stated in the Question. The further inquiry held by Mr. Kelly was ordered by the Local Government Board in pursuance of section 6 (4) (*b*), of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1906, the owner having presented a petition to the Board against the order made by Mr. Fitzpatrick. The Board, on consideration of Mr. Kelly's report and all the evidence, decided to accede to the petition in the two cases referred to. The grounds of objection relied upon by the petitioner, Mr. Langan, were set forth in his petition, copy of which was sent to the rural district council prior to the further inquiry. The Board are unable to say definitely what quantity of land Mr. Langan has in his possession, as he holds more than one farm. I understand that another appeal presented by him at the same time was disallowed.

Waterville Lake Fishing Industry.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that representations have been made by those engaged in the lake-fishing industry at Waterville, County Kerry, against the system lately practised of putting down the weir during the close season for the purpose of capturing spawning fish for the hatchery; and whether, in view of the opinion held locally that fish thus handled will not take a fly or bait in the following season, he will have inquiries made with a view to allowing a free passage for spring salmon in the Waterville River and safeguarding the interests of at least 100 persons whose means of livelihood is being seriously jeopardised.

MR. BIRRELL: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. I am assured that there is no foundation for the belief that the handling of salmon at a weir interferes with their subsequent susceptibility to capture by angling. The weir is fished under proper supervision, and all clean fish are passed over the weir without injury. It would be impossible to stock the hatchery without fishing the weir.

Caldbeck Estate, Queen's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in making the final distribution of the untenanted land on the Caldbeck estate, Ballacolla, Queen's County; whether the Estates Commissioners have approved of the allotments made by their inspector, Mr. Booth, in which the bailiff of the estate and a wealthy merchant in Ballacolla, who also keeps the post office, are apportioned two of the largest holdings on the untenanted land, to the exclusion of the small holders in the locality; and can he say when the inspector proposes again visiting Ballacolla.

MR. BIRRELL: The allotment of the untenanted land cannot be made by the Commissioners until their formal proposal to purchase has been accepted by the owner, and this proposal cannot issue until title has been proved. The Commissioners cannot say when their inspector will again visit Ballacolla.

Irish Landlords' Sporting Rights.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the case of tenants who have purchased under the Land Purchase Act of 1903, and in which purchase sporting rights have been reserved to the landlord, such reservation will give the landlord the right of taking any persons he likes along with him over the grounds of the tenants without his having first received permission from the tenants to take such persons with him.

MR. BIRRELL: The answer is in the affirmative. I would refer the hon. Member to subsection (4) of Section 13 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, which expressly empowers the landlord to authorise any persons to exercise the right of sporting.

Warning to Nationalist Newspapers.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state that, as a result of the warning given to certain newspapers against the publication of intimidatory resolutions of the United Irish League, there has been any material diminution or increase in the number of such resolutions published.

MR. BIRRELL: I understand that there has been some diminution recently in the publication of these notices. The Law Officers have under consideration some cases in which the warning has produced no effect.

Poor Law Reform (Ireland) Bill.

MR. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on what day he intends introducing the Poor Law Reform (Ireland) Bill; whether it is the intention of the Government to adopt the recommendations of the Vice-Regal Commission as the basis of the Bill; and whether he has entrusted the preparation of the Bill to persons who have practical experience of the working and administration of the Irish Poor Laws.

MR. BIRRELL: The Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress is expected to report before the end of the year, when the whole question of Poor Law reform will have to be considered. The recommendations of the Vice-Regal Commission generally will form the basis of legislation for Ireland, but it remains to be seen how far the Royal Commission may adopt similar recommendations. I cannot yet say at what date it will be possible to introduce a Bill on the subject. The Irish Government, will, of course, have the assistance of its most experienced officers in the preparation of the Bill.

Irish Workhouse Teachers' Salaries.

MR. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the salaries of teachers in Irish workhouses, though being paid in the first instance from the local rates, are subsequently refunded by the Government to the local authorities; and, if so, whether he can see his way to have this class of teachers included for a share in the supplementary grant in aid of National teachers.

MR. BIRRELL: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part of the Question, the supplementary grant of July last was in aid of the Vote for public education. No charge in respect of the salaries of teachers of Poor Law union schools has ever been borne on that Vote.

Irish Local Government Auditors.

MR. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the new rule made by the Irish Local Government Board with reference to the appointment of auditors will have the effect of debarring Poor Law officers from ever being promoted to these positions; and whether, if that be so, such a rule is against the principles of promotion in all public services.

MR. BIRRELL: Poor Law officers are not debarred from being appointed auditors if they possess the prescribed qualifications. These qualifications are held to be necessary to enable the auditors to perform their duties efficiently.

Ballyscullion Police Hut.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the police authorities to discontinue the police hut or barrack at Ballyscullion, near Toomebridge, County Antrim; and, if so, on what grounds.

MR. BIRRELL: The question of discontinuing this police hut is under consideration.

Illicit Distillation in County Antrim.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many prosecutions for illicit distilling and how many convictions there have been at Toome, in County Antrim, during the last five years.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that there has been no conviction or prosecution for illicit distillation in the Toome Petty Sessions district during the past five years.

Alleged Malicious Burning at Knockmay.

MR. PATRICK MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a youth named Thompson has been returned for trial on a charge of perjury in connection with the alleged malicious burning at Knockmay, Queen's County; whether the county-inspector, with the knowledge that Thompson's statement was false, ordered his statement to be taken on oath with the object of obtaining warrants to arrest three men who had been proved innocent; whether an inquiry will be held into this officer's conduct; and whether it is part of a police officer's duty to order statements to be taken on oath which, as in this case, he knew had been deliberately concocted.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, on 24th July, at a special Court held at Maryborough a summons was issued by order of the presiding magistrate; that County-Inspector Sweedy retained the summons in his office; that the magistrates had to order the return of the summons; and can he say by what authority the county inspector refused to execute a legal order of a magistrate made in Court.

I beg further to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sergeant Monahan received information of the alleged malicious burning at Knockmay, Queen's County, at 8.30 p.m. on 20th May last; whether he immediately reported the matter to his superior officer and visited the scene of the burning within an hour; that Sergeant Monahan has been censured and punished for alleged remissness in discharge of his duty; will he place the official Reports in this case upon the Table of the House or state in what particular Sergeant Monahan showed remissness in his duty; and whether there is any rule in the Police Code enabling a superior officer to punish men for an imaginary fault or through caprice.

MR. BIRRELL: As stated in my reply to a previous Question on this subject, asked by the hon. Member on the 25th ultimo, proceedings are pending against Joseph Thompson for perjury in connection with this case, and it is not, therefore, desirable to enter into further particulars of the matter. I have nothing to add to my previous reply with regard to Sergeant Monahan. The official police reports are confidential documents, and it would be contrary to practice to lay them on the Table.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) asked was the Chief Secretary aware that County-Inspector Tweedy had ordered Thompson's statement to be taken on oath although he was aware that the previous statement was false; and was not that suborning perjury, and was not Thompson insane?

MR. BIRRELL said he could not answer for Thompson's state of mind.

MR. DELANY asked did it not seem as if there were other Sergeant Sheridans in the police force.

[No Answer was returned.]

Land Purchase in Munster.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the average number of years purchase paid in each county of Munster under the Ashbourne and Balfour Acts, and the average number of years purchase paid under the Land Purchase Act, 1903; and whether Ashbourne purchasers who accepted an extension of time of repayment became entitled to decadal reductions of 10 per cent. or more at the end of the first ten years, another 10 per cent. or more at the end of twenty years, and a further reduction of more than 10 per cent. at the end of thirty years, thus making their average annual payment the same as if their annuity had been originally calculated at the rate of 3¼ per cent.

MR. BIRRELL: The particulars of the average number of years purchase paid in each county in Munster under the various Land Purchase Acts have appeared from year to year in the Annual Reports of the Land Commission and of the Estates Commissioners, to which I would refer the hon. Member. A purchaser under the Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1885, who accepted decadal revisions, and whose annuity in each decade was punctually and fully paid up, is liable to pay for each £100 advanced during the first decade, £4; during the second, £3 11s. 10d.; during the third, £3 4s. 6d.; and thereafter for forty-nine years, £2 17s. 11d. per annum. A purchaser under the Irish Land Act, 1903, is liable to pay £3 5s. for each £100 advanced throughout a period calculated to be sixty-eight and a half years. The systems are entirely different, and the average annuities can hardly be compared.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): Is it not the fact that this decadal reduction was strongly recommended by the Land Conference, and strongly objected to in influential quarters in Ireland owing to the fact that it added 25 per cent. to the tenants' payment, and is it not also the case that at the old purchase rate it would take at least seventy years to make as many peasant proprietors as has been made in the last five years under the present Act?

MR. BIRRELL: I must have notice of a Question of that character.

MR. FLAVIN: Was not the deduction 10 per cent. for three periods of ten years under the Act of 1896, whereas the tenants now get a further reduction of 15 per cent.?

MR. BIRRELL: One can hardly thus discuss the respective merits of different schemes.

Holycross Disturbances.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether eight men, who had been arrested in their beds at two o'clock in the morning, at Holycross, County Tipperary, and charged with riot and unlawful assembly, were then taken to a police barrack and tried before a resident magistrate, no local justice being permitted to take part in the proceedings; whether eighteen men subsequently arrested were tried in the same way, and returned for trial at Cork Winter Assizes without the option of bail; whether it is the practice in other parts of the United Kingdom to exclude the public from trials of this kind and to take the evidence in police barracks before a removable magistrate; and will he state under what law these proceedings have been carried out.

MR. BIRRELL: These men have been returned for trial at the Cork Winter Assizes, and I understand that the trial is actually proceeding. In these circumstances it is undesirable to make any statement on the subject.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): But surely this is a case for administrative action?

MR. BIRRELL: Pending the trial, I think I should abstain from answering these Questions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it the practice in England or Scotland for people to be taken into private buildings and tried by a magistrate without the option of defending themselves?

MR. BIRRELL: I daresay not.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What is the object of arresting people between two and three in the morning? Why cannot the arrests be made at a reasonable hour?

MR. BIRRELL: I have done my best, being myself very much averse to interference with sleep, to get the arrests made at reasonable hours, but I rather gather the difficulty is that of finding these people at home.

Intermediate Education Inspectors.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state how many new inspectorships are to be created by the Commissioners of Intermediate Education in Ireland; what will be the duties, powers, and emoluments of the inspectors; and how many women inspectors will be appointed.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of Intermediate Education have now been authorised to appoint six inspectors, and propose to exercise that power. They inform me that they do not intend to include women among the first six appointments. A statement of the powers, duties and emoluments of the inspectors cannot well be compressed within the limits of an oral reply, but I will communicate with the hon. Member on the subject.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): Have the Board given any reasons for not appointing any women inspectors among the first six?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not think they have. Everybody knows that this is a controversial subject, although I take the view that women should, as far as possible, be appointed to inspect girls' schools. Still, I cannot enforce my views on the Board.

MR. HAZLETON: Will the right hon. Gentleman ask the Board for the reason?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, I will.

MR. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state now whether certain memoranda were presented by persons connected with intermediate education in Ireland to the Commissioners of Intermediate Education demanding the appointment of men only to the new inspectorships; if so, by whom were these memoranda presented; and whether the Commissioners of Intermediate Education propose to entrust male inspectors with the duty of inspecting girls' schools.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of Intermediate Education inform me that they have received no demand such as is referred to in the Question. A communication has been received from the principal of one of the leading girls' intermediate schools in Ireland expressing great satisfaction that men only are to be appointed inspectors at first. The Board propose to entrust male inspectors with the duty of inspecting girls' schools. The Board have already for two years entrusted temporary male inspectors with the inspection of girls' schools, and for the past six years the inspection of all girls' schools in connection with the science courses of the Board's programme (domestic economy alone accepted) has been carried on by male inspectors of the Department of Agriculture and

Technical Instruction. No objection has been received from the authorities of the girls schools to either of these cases of inspection by men.

Firearms in Ireland.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received information of a case of shooting at a herdman at Ballyogan, County Clare, on Saturday; and whether anyone has been arrested.

Mr. BIRRELL: On the occasion in question, the herdman, accompanied by a constable who was protecting him, was driving some cattle to water when four shots were fired from a thick hazel cover. The herdman was struck with one grain of shot under the right eye. Subsequent examination showed that an ambush with retreats had been carefully prepared in the cover. The person or persons who fired the shots were thus enabled to escape, and no arrests have been made.

Captain CRAIG: Has the right hon. Gentleman taken any precautions to see that firearms do not fall into the hands of irresponsible persons?

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not think that I have now any power.

Captain CRAIG: Will the right hon. Gentleman legislate for power to prevent firearms falling into the hands of irresponsible persons?

Mr. BIRRELL: The hon. Gentleman knows that it is exceedingly difficult in Ireland, or in any other country, to keep firearms out of the hands of people who want to obtain them.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Is it not the fact that there was no difficulty whatever before the right hon. Gentleman repealed the Act?

Mr. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House the number of revolvers in the possession of Orangemen in the North of Ireland, and how many shots are fired?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that.

Mr. FLAVIN: I speak from personal experience.

Attack on Gurteen Police Patrol.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is in a position to give particulars of the attack made upon a police patrol at Gurteen, County Galway, on Saturday night, by a party of armed men in ambush; what injuries were inflicted upon the police; and how many arrests were made.

Mr. BIRRELL: Two arrests were made in this case, and the prisoners have been returned for trial. The case is, therefore, *sub judice*, and it is not desirable to enter into particulars.

Irish Education Grant.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has been stated that the recent grant of £114,000 was to be shared among all the national teachers in Ireland; and, if so, can he state why the workhouse teachers who are subject to the same rules as to classification and training, and who must teach the same subjects as ordinary national teachers, have received no share of this grant.

Mr. BIRRELL: No provision was made for the teachers of workhouse schools in connection with the supplementary grant of 24th July last. As stated in my reply to a Question asked by the hon. Member for West Belfast on 29th July last no charge in respect of the salaries of teachers of these schools has ever been borne on the Vote for public education. Such teachers are in the service of the boards of guardians.

Sales under the 1903 Land Act.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state when exactly in the normal course of a sale under the 1903 Land Act the Estates Commissioners give their decision as to whether or not the property proposed to be dealt with is an estate, distinguishing, if necessary, between direct and indirect sales; whether there has been any change in this practice; and, if so, when.

Mr. BIRRELL: Having regard to the decision in the case of Weir's estate, the Commissioners do not now provisionally declare lands to be an estate. The declaration is made when the Commissioners have completed their inquiries and before the lands are vested in the tenants, and the purchase money advanced.

Ormaithwaite Evicted Tenants.

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what is the cause of the delay in reinstating Thomas Walsh and the other evicted tenants on the Ormaithwaite property in North Kerry; whether compulsory powers have been taken by the Estate Commissioners for their reinstatement; and, if so, with what result.

Mr. BIRRELL: In this case, the owner has lodged a petition praying that the lands be not compulsorily acquired at the price offered without further inquiry. Judgment has not yet been delivered in the matter.

Mr. FLAVIN: Seeing that these tenants have now been out sixteen years, is it not time they were reinstated?

Mr. BIRRELL: The land cannot be compulsorily acquired until judgment has been delivered.

Mr. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the receiver of this particular estate in London told me this tenant would never put his foot inside the evicted holding?

Mr. BIRRELL: I cannot say anything as to that.

Ardfert Estate, North Kerry.

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Linsey Talbot Crosbie, of Ardfert, has sold his estate in North Kerry to the tenants; whether the Estates Commissioners were aware that when the estate was being sold that Mr. Crosbie had in his possession, outside of his demesne land, nearly 400 acres of grazing land; and whether the Estates Commissioners sanctioned the sale of the tenanted land without acquiring the grazing land for the enlargement of uneconomic holdings on the estate.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the tenanted portion of this estate was purchased and vested in the tenants in 1906. The owner applied to be allowed to re-purchase some 850 acres of demesne and other lands in his own occupation, but this was not sanctioned. He has since arranged to sell over 300 acres to persons coming within Section 2 of the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Mr. FLAVIN: Have the Estates Commissioners acquired this estate at their own price, and do they intend to divide it themselves?

Mr. BIRRELL: I must have notice of that.

Mr. FLAVIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman make representations to them to take care in dividing the land to bear in mind the needs of the poor people of the neighbourhood?

Mr. BIRRELL: That is one of the objects of acquiring the estate.

Mr. FLAVIN: But it is not done.

Cavan and Leitrim Railway.

Mr. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of resolutions passed at a meeting of district councillors representing the ratepayers in the guaranteeing area for the Cavan and Leitrim Railway, held at Keshcarrigan, in the county of Leitrim, on 3rd October, 1908; and whether, having regard to the facts contained therein and the grievances of the ratepayers of these districts, he will grant a sworn inquiry into the management and working of the said railway since it was opened for traffic.

Mr. BIRRELL: The resolutions referred to were received on 30th November. The Irish Government are in correspondence with the Board of Works on the subject.

Dundrum Bay Fisheries.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is aware that illegal trawling and trammel-net fishing is being extensively carried on in Dundrum Bay, County Down, to the detriment of the line fishermen of Newcastle and other villages on that coast; and will he say what steps his Department intend to take to put a stop to it.

Mr. BIRRELL: My hon. friend has asked me to reply to the Questions addressed to him to-day. As regards illegal trawling in Dundrum Bay, I would refer the hon. Member to the reply just given to a Question asked by the hon. Member for South Down†. The use of trammel-nets during the day is, in the absence of a bye-law, illegal. From some cause the fishermen have been under the impression that the practice was legal in Dundrum Bay. The Department are about to submit a bye-law making the use of these engines legal during the day in the place in question, and meantime they have felt hesitation in directing that prosecutions should be instituted against persons for following a practice which has been many years in operation.

Captain CRAIG: Has the Fishery Board steamer for the protection of fisheries patrolled this portion of the coast for the last five years?

Mr. BIRRELL: I will inquire.

Irish Trade Frauds.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) in reference to his statement at the Council meeting on the 24th instant that the Department intend to increase the number of inspectors with a view to the detection of fraud and adulteration practised by traders in Great Britain to the detriment of Irish manufacturers and producers, whether he will consider the advisability of appointing one or more qualified lady inspectors in connection with the lace, crochet, and textile industries of Ireland.

Mr. BIRRELL: The statement made at the meeting of the Council of Agriculture was to the effect that during the past six months the staff employed by the Department in Great Britain, for the detection of frauds had been increased by three assistants, and that a linen expert already in the Department's service had been detailed to deal specially with the question of frauds in linen goods. It is not proposed further to increase the staff at present. The Department have in their employment a lady inspector who is qualified to give expert evidence on samples of crochet, lace and other work of the kind.

Mr. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it was largely owing to inspection by a lady that huge frauds in connection with Irish lace were detected in London and a heavy fine inflicted on the offender

Mr. BIRRELL: I will communicate that lamentable fact to the Vice-President.

Irish Agricultural Grant.

Mr. ESSEX: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) how much of the last Vote granted to the Board of Agriculture and Techincal Education (Ireland) was devoted to the sole furtherance of Irish agricultural interests.

Mr. BIRRELL: If the hon. Member is referring to the Department's Endowment Fund, established under Sections 15 and 16 of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899, the present sum available for agricultural purposes as defined in Section 30 of that Act is £106,000, all of which is practically devoted to the furtherance of Irish agricultural interests. If, on the other hand, he is alluding to the annual Parliamentary Vote for the Department, it is obvious that it would not be possible accurately to state what amount thereof is solely devoted to those interests.

---

† *See* Questions and Answers circulated with the Votes this day.

The Gurteen Disturbances.

Mr. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Martin Finnerty, of Gurteen, County Galway, was arrested on Sunday last charged with a serious offence, and on yesterday returned for trial to Limerick Assizes which were then proceeding, and if Mr. Finnerty's trial is forced on by the Crown will he not be deprived of reasonable opportunity to prepare his defence.

Mr. BIRRELL: Martin Finnerty was, as I am informed, returned for trial in custody to the next Assizes for the County of Galway, but as the commission for the Winter Assizes is one of gaol delivery, I am advised that he must be brought up before the Judge presiding at Limerick Winter Assizes, and that any other course would be a violation of the law. It will be open to him to make any application for the postponement of his trial which he may be advised to make, and such application and the grounds of it will no doubt be fully considered by the Judge.

Mr. JOHN ROCHE further asked if on the previous day at Limerick thirty-one jurors were not ordered to stand aside by the Crown, and was not that a violation of the pledge given by the Attorney-General for Ireland?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. Notice must be given in the usual way. The Question ought, under the Standing Orders, to have been submitted to me before being asked in this way.

Irish Stationery Office Contracts.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the condition is attached to tenders for book-work printing for the Irish Stationery Office, that the contract must be executed in the City of Dublin; if so, will he state the reasons for such stipulation; and whether he will consider the advisability of allowing other Irish firms to tender for Government printing.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): I am informed that of the seven book-work printing contracts made by the Stationery Office in Ireland five must be executed in Dublin. This restriction is imposed in the interests of the Irish Public Departments who consider it necessary that the printer should be close at hand. The two remaining contracts may be executed in any part of Ireland. I understand that the same necessity is felt in London and Edinburgh, and that it is met in the same way, namely, by confining the execution of certain contracts to those cities.

Rathmoyle Letter Delivery.

Mr. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will reconsider his decision of not granting to Messrs. James Hogan and Patrick Kennedy, of Gaulstown, Rathmoyle, Kilkenny, a daily delivery of their letters from Tullaroan; is he aware that Mr. Hogan, who is a horse and cattle doctor, and known as Mr. Hogan of Tullaroan, suffers, as well as the farmers of the surrounding districts, inconvenience by reason of their letters going to the office of that place and being redirected; and, seeing that the Tullaroan postman in the discharge of his duties passes the doors of Messrs. Hogan and Kennedy every day, thereby rendering it of no cost or inconvenience, will he recommend that this grievance be removed.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have again considered the matter but I regret that, for the reasons which I recently explained to the hon. Member, I am unable to comply with his request. The Rathmoyle office is only one mile from the houses in question whereas the Tullaroan office is three miles.

Mr. MEAGHER: Does the Post Office study the convenience of a single individual rather than that of the people of the district?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: This matter has been considered from the point of view of the general convenience.

Kilmessan and Robinstown Postal System.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the post leaves Kilmessan at 5.25 p.m. for Robinstown to connect with the post car from Trim, which arrives at Robinstown at 9.45 p.m.; will he explain why almost five hours are taken to cover the distance from Kilmessan, which is only three and a half miles; will he consider the advisability of arranging for the post to leave Kilmessan at 7.30 p.m. to meet the mail car three and a half miles away at 9.45 p.m.; and, seeing that the bag containing the morning mails from Dublin reaches Kilmessan at 10.20 a.m. and is sent back empty by the 4.20 train, will he arrange for letters in reply to English letters brought down at 10.20 to be sent back in the bag that is now sent empty at 4.20.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The postman from Robinstown who serves Kilmessan is already absent from home for more than thirteen hours, and I do not think it right to extend the period of absence by making the hour of the evening collection later. The existing service is carried on at a loss to the revenue, and I regret I should not be justified in incurring additional expenditure on a day mail service.

MR. SHEEHY: What would be the amount of the increased expenditure involved?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON asked for notice of that Question.

The Archbishop of York.

MR. McARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, when he recommended the Crown to prefer the Suffragan Bishop of Stepney to the Archbishopric of York, he was cognisant of the views which had been expressed by that prelate, in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, with respect to the toleration of illegal and unauthorised ritual in the Church; and whether he was satisfied that the said Bishop, in his new office, would respect the law as declared by the Courts which have jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Before the Prime Minister answers the Question, may I ask whether in future in making recommendations to the Crown for high ecclesiastical preferment he would see that the gentleman he intends to recommend has a certificate of proficiency in faith and morals under the hand and seal of the hon. Gentleman?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The answer to both branches of the Question is in the affirmative.

Poor Law Relief Disqualification.

MR. ROGERS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the work of pension committees is being delayed by the want of an authoritative interpretation of the clause relating to the Poor Law disqualification in so far as it applies to married couples in receipt of outdoor relief; and whether, as the Commissioners of Inland Revenue and the Local Government Board are seemingly not agreed as to the precise effect on the *status* of the wife of the legal rule, which enjoins that all relief, for whomsoever granted, shall be considered as relief given to the husband, he will state which party is disqualified in the three following cases: where the husband receives relief for his own benefit, where the husband receives relief for the benefit of his wife, and where the husband receives relief for the benefit of himself and wife.

MR. ASQUITH: I am advised that in the first case the husband alone would be disqualified; in the last two cases both the husband and the wife would be disqualified.

Clergy in Parliament

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in the scheme of electoral reform which he has promised to submit to Parliament, he will include a revision of the statutes which forbid ministers of the Established Church to sit in the House of Commons.

MR. ASQUITH: I am afraid that I am not in a position at present to make any statement as to the provisions of the Bill in question.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

MR. GLOVER (St. Helens): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can state the date when the Report stage of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill will be taken.

MR. ASQUITH: Owing to my having given two more days to the Committee stage of the Education Bill, I regret that I am unable to find a day next week for the Report stage of the Eight Hours Bill, but I am hoping to take it on Monday and Tuesday week.

ADMISSION TO THE GALLERIES.

*SIR G. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I wish to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you have arrived at any decision in regard to the admission of strangers to the galleries of this House, and whether in your opinion any restrictions or regulations are necessary to safeguard the proper conduct of the business of the House?

*MR. SPEAKER: The House seems to regard with satisfaction the absence of strangers of both sexes; but I think it is obvious that the period of rest cannot continue for ever. It has occurred to me that probably the best way of solving the difficulty, if difficulty there be, is that the House should consent to the appointment of a small Committee for the purpose of considering under what new arrangements and conditions, if any, the galleries might be thrown open to the public at the commencement of next session.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: Cannot the restrictions as to the admission of strangers be relaxed so as to allow Members to introduce experts for advice—as has been done in the case of Ministers.

*MR. SPEAKER: Experts named by the leaders of the respective parties have been admitted.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he has any statement to make in regard to the course of business in the immediate future?

MR. ASQUITH: First of all, with regard to the business of to-day, I have a very important statement to make to the House, which is that the Government do not intend to proceed to-day with the Committee stage of the Education Bill. I need not give any special reasons for that, except to say that as we are now approaching, or should approach in accordance with the allocation of time, under the Closure Order, the consideration of Clause 3, which is the clause dealing with contracting-out, we feel that in the existing conditions, and until some settlement has been, as I hope it may be, arrived at, it might be a waste of Parliamentary time, and perhaps I may add that it might lead to the interposition of unnecessary difficulties in the way of approaching a settlement, if we were now, at this moment, to take up the discussion of that particular part of the Bill. I shall therefore propose, when the Order comes on, to postpone it until to-morrow. To-day we shall take the Poisons and Pharmacy Bill—which is the sixth of the Orders of the day—the White Phosphorous Matches Prohibition Bill, and other Bills which stand later on the Paper. Tomorrow and Saturday we shall go on with the consideration of the Education Bill in Committee and also on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. On Thursday I propose to move the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule for the remainder of the session and to make a statement in regard to public business. That will be followed by a Motion to allocate the time for the Report stage of the Education Bill, and after that the first Order will be the Report stage of the Port of London Bill.

MR. LONSDALE asked when it was intended to take the Second Reading stage of the Irish Land Bill.

MR. ASQUITH: I cannot at present fix a date, but I hope to be able to take it before the session ends.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY asked whether it was possible for them to go on with any other business on an allotted day for the Education Bill.

There was certain business to be disposed of, and that being withdrawn, he should like Mr. Speaker's ruling as to whether that withdrawal came under the case of disposal of the business contemplated by the last two clauses of the Guillotine Order.

*MR. SPEAKER: The business might be postponed, but that does not mean that it is disposed of. If the first Order is not proceeded with it does not count as an allotted day, and in that case the House can go through the Orders of the day.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: Is this not an allotted day since the Education Bill is put down as the first Order?

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) asked whether, by the terms of the Closure Resolution, an allotted day was not defined to be a day upon which this Bill was put down as the first Order.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member will look at the Closure Resolution he will see that it says: "Nothing in this Order shall prevent any business which under this Order is to be concluded on allotted days, being proceeded with on any other days."

MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): May I ask whether, in allotting time for future business, the right hon. Gentleman, the Prime Minister will bear in mind the almost universal desire of this House to see the Housing Bill passed this session?

MR. ASQUITH: I will bear that in mind.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby) asked if it was not highly probable that the Education Bill would be dropped.

[No Answer was returned.]

HOUSING, TOWN PLANNING, ETC. BILL [TITLE AMENDED].

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee B.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 345.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 345.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 386.]

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 346.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 346.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 387.]

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Ernest George Pretyman, esquire, for the County of Essex (Mid or Chelmsford Division).

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Children Bill, with Amendments.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [H.L.].

Order for Second Reading read.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland), in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said that the Bill which the House had expected to take that day was one of the chief measures of the session, while this Bill was of purely departmental importance. If this subject came before the House for the first time or if it raised any question of controversy, then some inconvenience might be caused by this sudden change of scene, but in view of the history and nature of the Bill, he trusted that the

House would not be unwilling to consider its proposals. The Bill had three purposes. Clause 1 brought up to date the Schedule of poisons which was attached to the Pharmacy Act of 1868, in the light of the knowledge of medical and pharmaceutical science which had been acquired in the last forty years. Clause 2 would, he thought, be warmly welcomed by agricultural Members, many of whom he saw in their places. It dealt with the supply of sheep dips, and weed killers, and preparations for the destruction of insects, which contained poisonous materials and which at the present time technically were under the provisions of the ordinary law. Much inconvenience was caused by the restriction on the sale of these commodities to persons who were chemists, and agriculturists had long desired that some other facilities should be given for obtaining these articles. In fact the present law could not be enforced, and these articles were largely sold by persons who were not qualified under the Pharmacy Act. Clause 2 provided that where the existing facilities were insufficient—it was not intended to compete with the chemists where they were available to sell these articles—the local authorities might licence traders, other than registered chemists, to sell these articles subject to regulations which were to be made as provided in the Bill. This proposal followed the recommendation of a very strong Departmental Committee which sat on the subject in 1901, and which was appointed by the late Government, and which recommended the change of the law embodied in the Bill. With regard to these provisions, there was little difficulty, and he imagined that there could be no objection. There were also a few other minor matters embodied in the later clauses. But the third main provision of the Bill raised a point which had, in the past, given rise to some considerable controversy. It was found to be necessary that companies which conducted the business of drug stores should be made liable for offences against the Pharmacy Act committed by their agents. That was a proper change of the law which drug stores themselves conceded to be necessary. It arose out of a legal decision that where an unqualified person was selling poisons in a shop belonging to a drug store company that unqualified person was alone to be punished and the company could not be punished, because it was not a "person" within the meaning of the Pharmacy Act. When, however, it was proposed to amend the law and make the drug store companies liable in such cases, a keen controversy at once arose between the chemists and the drug stores, not on that particular point, but on another one, namely, whether or not drug stores should be allowed to use the title of chemists. On the one hand, the qualified chemist said that he had to undergo a prolonged training, that he had to pay for an expensive education, and that he ought to have a monopoly of this business of dispensing medicine. On the other hand, the friends of the drug stores pointed out that they for many years past had been carrying on their business without interference by the law, that they supplied a popular need, and that to deprive them of the title they had long been accustomed to use, would practically destroy their business. On this point a keen controversy arose. There was a babel of tongues. The letter-boxes of Members of Parliament were filled with controversial pamphlets, and the advertisement columns of the newspapers were resplendent with manifestoes on the subject. When he first took up this subject, as representing in this House the Privy Council Office, in whose sphere the matter rested, he was told by both parties that there was only one point on which they were in agreement, and that was that any agreement between them was impossible. However, fortunately, now the case wore a different aspect. The Bill was introduced this year in the House of Lords in a non-controversial form, leaving open this vexed question in dispute between these two important trading interests. The Bill was referred to a Joint Committee of the two Houses, who heard evidence from both sides, and who were thoroughly representative. This Committee reported the Bill to the House of Lords very closely in the form in which it now stood. Since that time there had been prolonged negotiations with the organised chemists, with the representatives of the drug stores, and with the representatives of the co-operative societies, and to-day he was happy to be in a position to state that all three parties were reconciled with one another, that they all accepted the Bill in the form in which it was now before the House, subject to some amendments of detail of a very technical character, which it would be his duty to move in Committee. Under these circumstances, as this long controversy was now at an end, he trusted the House would consider this a favourable moment to assent to the Second Reading of the Bill. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he had listened with interest to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, because he remembered the controversies to which he alluded which took place at the time of the last election. He recollected that he had a very long interview with chemists in his then constituency, and he came to the conclusion that while something could be said on their side of the question there was a good deal to be said on the other. There did not appear to him to be the slightest hope of any agreement being arrived at between the two contending parties, but now he understood that an agreement had been come to. He had, however, had two communications from different people interested in the Bill, and he would like to ask the Under-Secretary a few questions in regard to them. The first communication he had was from the Grocers' Association in London. They objected to certain provisions of the Bill, and regretted that grocers should be allowed to sell poisonous substances, provided they were wrapped in a label which bore the name of a certified chemist, and they asked him to move an Amendment to this effect when the Bill got into Committee. This was an extremely technical Bill, and he replied that he did not think that anyone who was not an expert in the question should move an Amendment dealing with such an important subject as the sale of poisons. He did not know whether the Grocers' Association was in the right or in the wrong, but what he wanted to ask the Under-Secretary was whether, in view of the fact that the sale of poisons was a very important matter to safeguard, there was any foundation for the complaint of the Grocers' Association, whether he had looked into the matter and whether any alteration should be made in the Bill. Then he had an appeal from the chemists in his constituency, in which they said that at last this matter had been agreed to, subject to an Amendment to be introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary. He thought, before they passed the Second Reading of the Bill, they ought to have some indication of what the Amendment was, because it seemed to him that the Bill at the moment was not an agreed one, but that it rather resembled the Education Bill, which was brought in as an agreed measure, but when they got into Committee they found that it was the reverse. This, therefore, was not an agreed Bill; that was to say, the chemists did not agree except on the understanding that the right hon. Gentleman would introduce an Amendment which would suit their aims and objects. He did not wish to say a word about the Amendment, he did not know what it was, but they ought to know. It must not be forgotten that no doubt there was considerable grievance on the part of the chemists, and while he quite agreed that a company could not be prosecuted for committing any offence committed by its servants, that commonly the servants would be prosecuted, and that that wanted altering, it seemed to him that nothing should be done which would prevent large chemist companies continuing a business which they had carried on for a considerable time. They had been a very great boon to the poorer classes on account of the high prices charged by chemists, whereas they could now go to places like Boot's Stores and get drugs at prices much more reasonable. While they ought to safeguard the rights of the chemists, they ought not to give them a monopoly which would allow them to charge excessive prices. He did not wish to offer any opposition to the Bill, and he was glad that the right hon. Gentleman had been able to secure an agreement on the question. He hoped the Home Secretary, who had not spoken, would inform them what was the Amendment which it was proposed to move, so that before they went to a Second Reading they might have some knowledge of what they were assenting to.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said he only desired to add an observation to what had been said by his hon. friend, and the Under-Secretary would acknowledge that he was intervening in the debate with no desire to consume the time of the House, because a year ago he waited upon the right hon. Gentleman, as a member of a deputation which called attention to the undoubted grievance which was then felt by chemists. He only rose to ask how far the chemists the hon. Gentleman had mentioned could be relied on. He had heard some of the chemists in his constituency expressing a little doubt as to the Amendment it was contemplated to introduce in the Bill. He could not pretend that he was in entire agreement with what had fallen from his hon. friend as to the quarrel between the chemists and the corporate body, but he would venture to say, in qualification of what had fallen from his hon. friend, that chemists who had undergone a highly specialised education in order to fit themselves for their occupation felt it a very great grievance that they were not to enjoy the same *status* as medical and legal practitioners. The Government should indicate in a general way what the nature of the Amendment which it was proposed to put into the Bill would be, so that the House in giving it a Second Reading, should not be in the dark, but able to feel, having the advantage of the assurance of the Under-Secretary, that they were not failing in carrying out the pledges they had given to their constituents.

MR. WINFREY (Norfolk, S.W.) desired to say, as the Member placed in charge of the Bill of the Pharmaceutical Society, that after the negotiations which had taken place with regard to the Government Bill the clause dealing with chemists was now considered quite satisfactory to the Pharmaceutical Society. The clause which it was proposed to introduce had been placed before the largest meeting of the Society that had ever taken place, and they expressed themselves as being quite satisfied.

Sir F. Banbury.

MR. F. E. SMITH asked if the Amendment might be read.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the point was an extremely technical one, and not easy to follow. The effect of the clause as it would appear when amended was that a drug store must have a duly qualified chemist in charge of the actual dispensing of the medicines containing the scheduled poisons. That was the present law, and would be continued, but in addition to that a drug store company must also have a superintendent to manage the poisons department of the company. This superintendent must be a director of the company if the company wished to use the title of chemist and druggist. If the company had got only one shop, the superintendent and the dispenser would be one and the same person, but if the drug company had a number of shops, it must have a duly qualified chemist as dispenser in each shop to dispense such medicines, and must also have a general manager of the poisons department, who was a qualified chemist. The drug companies and chemists agreed to that as a reasonable solution of the whole question. The title pharmacist was limited to chemists and druggists individually registered, but the drug stores which conformed to all the conditions could still retain the title chemist and druggist.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) asked for a little more information on one or two points. Clause 2 had not been explained very adequately. The point he was anxious to safeguard was that no undue difficulty should be put in the way of agriculturists and horticulturists obtaining weed-killers and sheep dips, or whatever might be required for their purposes. It was also essential that no onerous conditions should be put upon those who sold these things. At present, these articles could be sold by anybody without a licence. The clause in question went further than was necessary in restricting the sale of these articles. Vendors had to get a licence from the local authority, and to conform to any regulations which the local authority made. The Bill said the local authority in granting a licence should have regard to the reasonable requirements of the public. He did not think that was quite a fair way of putting it. The local authority might say: "One very good sheep dip is being sold by so-and-so, therefore we will not give a licence to somebody else to sell another dip" which, in the opinion of some qualified to judge, might be just as advantageous. He did not think it should be in the power of a local authority to withhold a licence for such a reason as that. He thought a licence ought to be given whenever it was applied for. With regard to Clause 3 it was very satisfactory to hear that the quarrels between the retail chemists and the drug stores had been compromised. The compromise seemed very fair all round. With regard to Clause 5, the Home Secretary would remember that he addressed a Question to him recently with reference to the sale of vitriol, and the right hon. Gentleman assured him that the control of the sale of vitriol was a point that was going to be carefully safeguarded in this Bill. Subsection (2) undoubtedly dealt with the sale of vitriol, but at the same time he did not think that labelling it poison and taking the name of the purchaser would be sufficient to make the procuring of vitriol more difficult than it was at present. It would be of considerable advantage if the hon. Member would inform them what the regulations were likely to be under the proposed Order in Council. Outrages of vitriol throwing had been far too common of late, and he was sure that the House would be willing to adopt any method which was considered advisable to make the purchase of this substance as difficult as possible. If the answer of the hon. Member were satisfactory on this point, he would not oppose the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said this Bill had come on so suddenly that he had not had time to look up his papers dealing with two different interests the representatives of which had asked him to watch the Bill and see that certain guarantees, if possible, were given before it was passed. He was not opposing the Second Reading. Among the interests which were being touched by the Bill were those of the sellers of weed killers and sheep dips. These preparations were chiefly sold by ironmongers, and in his own district there was some feeling between the chemists and ironmongers in regard to this matter. In boroughs of the class which he represented, there was a large rural area together with an urban area, and there was an intimate connection between the surrounding country and the town. There was keen competition between the ironmongers and the chemists, and he should like to know from the Under-Secretary whether, under the Bill, the sale of weed killers and sheep dips by ironmongers would be stopped. He was inclined to think that that would be a rather harsh measure which would be resented by agriculturists near country towns. He practically agreed with his noble friend opposite on this matter, and he would be greatly obliged if the Under-Secretary would deal with the question he had put.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said it was very important that agriculturists throughout the country should not be put to any kind of inconvenience in regard to obtaining weed killers, sheep dip, and similar preparations which they required. What would be the difference between the law as it now existed and as it would be made by Clause 2 in regard to the ordinary agriculturist? He was not a chemical expert, but he ventured to suggest that there were certain sheep dips and weed killers which contained substances other than "arsenic, tobacco, or the alkaloids of tobacco," mentioned in the clause, though he saw in the same clause that—

> "His Majesty may by Order in Council amend this provision by adding thereto or removing therefrom any poisonous substance."

That seemed to him to be an unnecessary and possibly harsh restriction. Take his own experience. He had used a substance, which was composed of some poison or other, he did not know what it was, to rub on the backs of his cattle. This had the effect of preventing the water-fly settling upon them, thus giving the animals relief and preventing them from galloping about the field to escape the insect. It would be an unnecessarily harsh restriction if a farmer could not purchase the substance except at the place of a registered chemist. As he read Clause 2 he would not be able to purchase it elsewhere unless an Order in Council was obtained. That Order in Council, he presumed, would go to the county council, from the county council to the district council, and from the district council to the person who desired to sell the particular preparation. That was a very lengthy process, and it was hardly necessary to place a restriction of that kind in the Bill. He should like the Under-Secretary to tell them what would be the actual effect of this clause upon the agriculturists of the country, whether it would make any serious difference in their opportunities to purchase these necessary articles containing poisonous substances which every farmer had to use at some period of the year, and whether he could not see his way to removing or altering subsection (1) of Clause 2, by making it a little more feasible for agriculturists to obtain these preparations. Another point which he desired to raise was with reference to subsection (3) of Clause 3. He understood that chemists' companies were to be registered as chemists and druggists, and not as pharmacists, and that this had been agreed upon by all parties concerned, and therefore no objection was made to that provision.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL was understood to indicate assent.

Mr. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne) said they were told that this was an agreed Bill, but there was a clause in it the inclusion of which in the agreement he could not understand. He referred to subsection (4) of Clause 3, which insisted that before a business carried on by a company could be described as a chemists' business, there must be one director of the concern who was a duly registered pharmaceutical chemist. Take the position of Whiteley's Stores, or the Army and Navy Stores, or any other of those great organised businesses, each with a chemist and druggist department. How was one man, who had received a University education perhaps, and had become a qualified chemist, to take part in the administration of those huge businesses? He thought such a provision ought not to be forced on any concern. By all means let them provide further protection for the public, but in the carrying out of an organised business it was no part of the duty of the House to inflict such a condition upon these great business undertakings. They had some knowledge of the attitude sometimes taken by the Pharmaceutical Society, who caused to be inflicted on those who sold anything which came under Pharmaceutical Acts a fine of £5 or £10. There was no appeal against that. A person was at once brought up to the County Court. He had even known cases in which a fine had been inflicted though the article sold was not poisonous. Articles which usually contained poisons, in order that they might be sold by co-operative societies and stores had the poisons removed from them, but many people who carried on stores and had sold these preparations with the poisons removed had been unjustly fined because there could be no appeal, and the fines were collected by the County Court. He himself had considerable doubt about giving these societies increased powers. Let them give the public authorities or the public inspectors all the assistance they could, but they ought not to give over to committees of chemists or any other body the power to inflict penalties and administer the law of the country

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) thought the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down were just. He understood that subsection (4) of Clause 3 was being modified, but he gathered that the change did not apply to the point raised by the hon. Member below the gangway. To require that a qualified chemist should be placed on the board of the Army and Navy, Harrod's, Parker's, Boot's or other companies' stores was to put upon them a very onerous obligation indeed.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: They are all agreed.

Lord BALCARRES asked whether the Army and Navy Stores had agreed to have a qualified chemist on their board because they had a chemist's department? They knew what compromises were in vague conversations and how different they were when they came to be reduced to the precise language of the draftsman in a Bill. The chemist's department in these big businesses represented an infinitesimal fraction of those businesses, and it was very unfair to ask those big companies to bring on to their boards men who very likely would be perfectly useless on general commercial questions in order to qualify for the term "chemists," which he should say those companies were as much entitled to use as any great firm. That was a point which required consideration. The Under-Secretary had revolutionised Clause 3 by Amendments proposed to subsection (4), but until those Amendments were on the Paper they could not know what their purport would be. There were two points to which he wished to advert. One was the effect of this proposal on the ordinary business man who sold these substances in the country districts; and, secondly, as to the extended powers which the Home Office was going to take upon its shoulders under the Bill. Everyone knew that in agricultural districts these poisons were now sold by the local "vet.," and the veterinary surgeon, though not always qualified to take that title, knew what these articles were. He knew what the ordinary proportions were and he dealt in articles which were as a rule made up for him by some respectable chemist in a neighbouring town, and he almost defied the Home Office to say that the scandals which had been caused in the last few years by the illicit use of poison could in the smallest percentage of cases be traced to these country veterinary officers. It was not with them that the scandal began nor upon them that these severe measures should fall. The scandals began in the bogus urban chemist's shop. That was where poisons were improperly bought, and it was against them only that it was really necessary to invoke all these immense powers. As the Bill was drafted, the ordinary veterinary surgeon, who for years past had been in the habit of supplying sheep dip to farmers, would have to obtain a licence. He did not see why the local authority should be allowed to prevent this man from selling these poisons unless it could be shown, and it had not been shown, that it had been the cause of scandal in the past. His real objection to the way the Bill was drafted was that a general scheme was laid down by Parliament, and that actually within the four corners of the Bill the Government took to itself the right to abrogate all or any portions of the Bill. By subsection (3) of Clause 1 the Home Office was entitled to lay down the most minute conditions governing the trade of men who dealt in those poisonous substances.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Privy Council.

Lord BALCARRES: But that is under the Home Office.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: Not at all.

Lord BALCARRES said then it ought to be.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Home Office has never dealt with the question of poisons or medical questions. They have always been the business of the Privy Council.

Lord BALCARRES said they had not the experts. The Home Office was the Department dealing with explosives. There were two items in Schedule 1 which were material ingredients of the most dangerous explosives in the world. He was not going to attack the Home Office. He was going to criticise the growing tendency of this Government to take the right in its Bills to abrogate what Parliament had settled. He thought the Home Office could make regulations of a far-reaching character. Apparently he was wrong, and it was not the Home Office but the Privy Council, but it made very little difference. Let the House consider the six sub-heads on which regulations were to be made: first as to the granting of licences and the selection of authorities which had that duty; then the duration, renewal, revocation, suspension, extension and reduction of such licences. That seemed to ensure that a poor man who had got his licence was to have no peace. It said that all kinds of regulations might be made about keeping, inspecting and copying the register of licences, and the keeping, transporting, and selling of poisonous substances. That really was giving a Government Department too much latitude. He was not opposed to making proper regulations for dealing with these poisonous substances, but he thought a Government Department at Whitehall, in drawing up its regulations, was often apt to overlook the difficulties. A man living in the country might safely keep his poisonous substances in a manner which would be intolerable in London. He knew cases where local authorities had themselves kept substances of a highly dangerous character in a box by the side of the road for years, and no objection had ever been taken. It was known it was there, but it was not dangerous because it was in an out-of-the-way part of the country, and the material was concealed in a wood. Now they made a precise declaration which would apply to London just as much as to the wild lands of some country parish, and the regulations were bound to be harassing. The only safeguard that the public had was that the Order in Council was to be placed before Parliament, but what was the good of that? There was no protection in it. It was a purely nominal affair. Questions might be asked on it, but that was no check upon the Privy Council, which had not a representative in the House of Commons. But the Department also put restrictions in Clause 5 on the sale of certain mineral acids, which they said must have the word "poison" on the outside of the bottle, and the name of the person who sold it. That was a perfectly futile regulation. Everyone who had been interested in the cases which had recently occurred, and which had been wholly urban, knew that where a man had been charged with having failed to mark "poison" outside, the label had got wet and had come off. They should deal with these matters in a much more specific manner, and insist that the bottle itself should be marked and not a label stuck on which might come off in a moment. They had power to make new regulations. Clause 2 took special power at any time to revise or withdraw the regulations which had been made, and there was a penalty of £5. He had received a good deal of correspondence with regard to the Bill, and a good many of his correspondents were unaware that an agreement had been arrived at. They viewed the Bill, if not with hostility, certainly with some suspicion. If Clause 3 had been agreed to so much the better. It put a long and tiresome controversy out of the way. But he was quite sure the Under-Secretary ought to give adequate time before any further stage of the Bill was taken.

*Mr. IDRIS (Flint Boroughs) said very little was obtained by the chemists on the joint committee, but having regard to the urgent need for legislation a compromise had since been arrived at with everybody concerned as far as he could judge. The Joint Stock Companies Association and the Co-operative Stores agreed to, and such companies as John Barker and Company strongly supported these restrictions. The regulations which might be made as to the substances which might be put in and taken out of the Schedule by the Government Department were objectionable to him, as also were a good many of the powers given under the Schedule, but to some extent he found in other countries, such as France and Germany, Government Departments undertook this duty and the work was done remarkably well. He had had as an interested party several times jointly with others to make representations to the Privy Council, and he had come to the conclusion that business was done there remarkably well, and the publication of these proposed regulations would certainly enable those who objected to them to make representations to the Government Department, and in all probability they could obtain modifications if necessary in the public interest. The noble Lord had spoken of the licences applying in all towns, even in London. There were not many sheep in London. He believed they were intended to apply only to agricultural districts where it was said farmers found it difficult to obtain these poisons. The inspection of the books of licence-holders was an absolute necessity for the public safety in order to trace cases of criminal poisoning. In nearly all cases of poisoning by arsenic the poisoning went on until several members of a family had been killed before it was suspected. It was not until there had been a large number of deaths that the suspicion of neighbours was aroused and inquiries were made. In the country it was quite a common superstition among horse-keepers that arsenic gave horses a glossy coat. The present state of the law was simply chaos with regard to the sale of poisons. There was no sufficient check on anything, and the restrictions in this Bill were very much in the public interest. Some people were not satisfied with the measure—in fact, many chemists were far from satisfied with it. The only thing in the Bill in favour of chemists was that in future they would be able to call themselves pharmacists. Many of the details would be best threshed out in Committee. He could assure the House from a close study of this question that the Bill contained nothing prejudicial to the public interest, whilst on the other hand it was very necessary for the protection of the public. He hoped the Bill would receive a sympathetic reception. One hon. Member thought there ought to be a more stringent restriction on the sale of vitriol, but having regard to the many interests concerned he thought they had chosen the best compromise. They had given the makers of agricultural poisons and the purchasers of them every possible facility and they had protected the title of "chemist" to some extent.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) asked the Government to make it quite clear that it was not intended by Clause 2 to make it more difficult but easier to obtain poisons necessary in agricultural pursuits, and he appealed to the Under-Secretary of State for the Home Office to see that the Orders in Council were issued with the utmost despatch. It was, for instance, very important that fruit-growers should be able to get the materials for their spraying. Probably a great deal of the mixture used would be used this winter for winter spraying, and it was of the utmost importance that they should be able to obtain it before it was too late. He hoped also the Government would see their way to extend somewhat the exceptions to the Act, because there were a variety of substances which, although not of general use, were very valuable in certain isolated cases. There were one or two diseases with which fruit-growers had to contend in which it was almost necessary to use cyanides of different kinds. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would bear that in mind and consider whether it was not also possible to extend the list to certain well-recognised animal medicines, which one found or ought to find in every well-conducted stable. He did not think it ought to be necessary to go to a chemist to obtain those things. It was sometimes difficult to obtain what one wanted, and it was inconvenient always to have to go to a registered chemist. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would make this point quite clear, because the agriculturists of the country were very eager to have Clause 2 placed upon the Statute-book this year, and that he would see that no undue delay occurred before the Orders in Council were issued and the advantages of the clause obtained.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) suggested that in the exceptional circumstances the Under-Secretary to the Home Department should either put the terms of the new clause on the Order Paper or furnish them to the Press, so that everybody interested would see exactly how the matter stood. He thought the House would agree that some regulations in the way of licensing were necessary. In many parts of the country some of these poisons were kept by grocers and general storekeepers, and if the person who had charge of them was careless there was a danger of the bag containing the ingredients of sheep-dip, for example, bursting and the contents getting mixed with other goods sold in the shop. It was certainly necessary that the local authority, which was acquainted with the character of the persons who retailed those poisons, should be consulted as to whether they were suitable persons to hold a licence. The Bill was an immense improvement and produced some order out of chaos. He was glad the right hon. Gentleman had been able to announce an agreement on this long-argued question.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said there were two reasons why he supported this Bill. In the first place it was a Bill that had come from another place, where he was sure it had received full and ample discussion and consideration; and in the second place no guillotine Motion had been put upon it. He also supported the Bill because he understood it was a compromise arrived at between the chemists and the drug store companies. Like other hon. Members, he had had during the last two years innumerable communications, not only from his own constituents, but from all parts of the country, urging him, on behalf of the chemists, to resist the Bill before the House; and he had also had representations from the companies, pointing out that their demands were just and asserting that the chemists were most unreasonable people. It was very difficult to know what was right and proper in these matters, but as they had been assured by the Under-Secretary and hon. Members opposite who spoke for the Pharmaceutical Society that the Bill was satisfactory, as non-experts they did not need to indulge in much criticism on the Second Reading. He did not think it was quite reasonable of the hon. Member for Ashton to state that he strongly objected because one director of these trading companies had to be a qualified chemist. This Bill was a compromise, and therefore, neither side could hope to get all they wanted. They had an instance of the difficulty of arranging a compromise in the case of the Education Bill, which was now in a very parlous condition. If the representatives of companies in the House were going to oppose the Second Reading or criticise it because they could not get everything they wanted, and refused to budge to meet the chemists, then he thought they must rather despair of getting any legislation on the subject. From what he had heard he thought this was a fair compromise, and therefore, he should support the Second Reading. As regarded Clause 2, subsection (1), which laid down that those who were to be allowed to sell certain poisons were to have a licence from the local authority, he most strongly supported that proposal. The people who sold those poisons ought to be under some supervision, and he could imagine no better body than the local authority to have the supervision of these people. He presumed that in towns the authority would be the borough council, and in the counties the county council. One hon. Member had urged that the list of poisons sold by these people ought to be extended, but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be very careful in extending the list of poisons which might be sold by these more or less irresponsible people, because, although they were licensed, they were not like properly qualified chemists. He did not think that dangerous poisons should be put into the hands of inexperienced people in view of the risks which the last speaker had pointed out might arise if these people were allowed to continue as in the past to store and sell these things. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman in his reply would state why Ireland was to be treated differently from England and Wales in this matter. If he could explain subsection (*a*) of Section 6 he would be obliged, because a more outrageous instance of legislation by reference he had never read. The subsection was as follows:—

> "For the reference to the Pharmacy Act, 1868, there shall be substituted a reference to the Pharmacy Act (Ireland), 1875, and the Pharmacy Act (Ireland), 1875, Amendment Act, 1890, and the reference to regulations made under Section 1 of the first-mentioned Act shall not apply."

Was it reasonable at five minutes notice to ask the House to criticise such a subsection as that? There was only one other point which he wished to raise. It was a point which, though it might be impossible to deal with it under this Bill, it would be advisable to include if time could be found to do so. He meant that some means should be found to deal with the extensive use of morphia and other drugs which had unhappily become very prevalent in this country, not only among men but also among women. He noticed that Section 5 of the Bill said—

> "It shall not be lawful to sell any substance to which this section applies by retail, unless the box, bottle, vessel, wrapper, or cover in which the substance is contained is distinctly labelled with the name of the substance and the word 'Poison,' and with the name and address

of the seller of the substance, and unless such other regulations as may be prescribed under this section by Order in Council are complied with . . . ."

Subsection (2) of the same clause said—

> "The substances to which this section applies are sulphuric acid, nitric acid, hydrochloric acid, soluble salts of oxalic acid, and such other substances as may for the time being be prescribed by Order in Council under this section."

Though perhaps when this Bill was originally introduced the question which he raised now was not in the minds of the promoters, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could see his way to include in the list of substances, with respect to which regulations might be made from time to time by Order in Council, morphia and other things which were used in the drug habit. They had been trying to legislate about drinking, and they had not agreed as to the means to be taken to decrease it, but really the drug habit in this country was insidiously, and without the whole nation knowing, doing nearly as much harm as drinking. If the right hon. Gentleman could see his way, either in this Bill or in some other way, to introduce such measures as would diminish the facilities for obtaining these drugs from chemists and other people, he would do more than could be done by any Licensing Bill to promote morality and upright conduct in this country.

Mr. VIVIAN (Birkenhead) said the co-operative societies had for the last two or three years resisted the passing of this Bill, but what was called the compromise had given them all the satisfaction they required. There were just two points he wished to deal with. First of all the Bill did not prevent co-operative bodies from carrying on the business of chemists and druggists. The first portion of subsection (4) of Clause 3 gave ample power to carry on business. There was no restriction of any kind in that direction. The other point had reference to the question of title. There had been some difference of opinion on that point between the promoters of the Bill and the co-operative organisations. The chemists protested against the use of the personal title of chemists or pharmacists by corporate bodies, but they were willing that these bodies should use any title which would place before the public full information of the fact that they were carrying on this business. They might therefore adopt such names as "Drug store," "Drug selling department," "Pharmaceutical department," "Department of chemistry," "Dispensing department," "Sale of medicines and drugs departments," or even "Pharmacy and drugs department." The co-operative bodies said that that was sufficient to meet their views, and they had no desire to trench on the personal title, so long as they were able to carry on this particular business. The second portion of the subsection left them free to carry on business under such titles as he had mentioned. There remained, therefore, no substantial difference between the co-operative bodies and the chemists. Personally, he objected to all kinds of restrictions. He sympathised with the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London on that point. In what he had said he had expressed the views of 1,500 co-operative organisations. He believed he had also expressed the views of the Army and Navy Stores, and similar institutions. The powers contained in the clause would amply serve their purpose

Mr. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) in supporting the Second Reading of the Bill said he especially favoured the measure because it dealt with the subject raised by his hon. friend the Member for Blackpool. It was most desirable that steps should be taken to remedy the evil which had come to be known as "the drug habit." He thought it would be some consolation to his hon. friend to know that this Bill did something to stiffen up the law with regard to the sale of morphia and other preparations.

Mr. ASHLEY: Where is the provision?

Mr. FORSTER said it was provided for in this way. Clause 1 said—

> "Schedule A. to the Pharmacy Act, 1868 (which specifies the articles to be deemed poisons within the meaning of that Act), is hereby repealed, and the schedule to this Act shall be substituted therefor."

The schedule of the Act of 1868 did not contain any reference to opium or any of the preparations derived from opium. The schedule of this Bill included "Opium, and all preparations or admixtures containing 1 or more per cent. of morphine." Section 17 of the Act of 1868 stated the conditions under which it was unlawful to sell poisons, and by applying that Act, as amended by the Bill now before the House, to opium they were really making a very drastic alteration of the law which he most heartily welcomed. There was not the slightest doubt that the drug habit was largely on the increase. It was one of the most insidious and deplorable diseases to which man or woman could succumb, and anyone who knew of its ravages could not feel other than grateful to those who were making it possible to do something to deal with the question. He knew something of the evil of the drug habit. He happened to be a member of a voluntary committee which was formed to inquire into the genuineness of one of the cures for inebriety which had been established in the Metropolis. Their proceedings were full of interest. The committee had before them cases in which, so far as they were able to tell, an absolute cure had been effected. The stories of misery which were told by the people who had been cured almost brought tears to the eye, even of a hardened politician like himself. He, for one, would feel real gratitude for any opportunity of doing something to make more difficult the acquisition by those unhappy people of the drugs which they abused. That reason would make the Bill acceptable to him if there was no other. He supported the suggestion that vitriol should be included in the schedule. He would be very glad to see the conditions of the sale of these drugs stiffened.

*Mr. HEDGES (Kent, Tonbridge) wished to call attention to the latter part of subsection (4) of Clause 3, which he did not think was necessary. Chemists jealously guarded the use of the title "chemist," and it appeared from the speech of the hon. Member for Birkenhead that corporations and large companies who had been taking that title were no longer desirous of using it. Under the latter part of Clause 3, the monopoly of the use of the title "chemist" had been taken away, and the title of "pharmacist" was given instead. It was not altogether fair to men who had served a long apprenticeship and who had after study passed difficult examinations, to deprive them of this title of "chemist" and give them that of "pharmacist," a term which would be obscure to the man in the street.

Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that the Bill had come on so suddenly that he had been unable to ascertain what was the full opinion of his constituents on the subject matter of the Bill, although he had had a great deal of correspondence about it. There were many more points of interest in the Bill than those to which the Under-Secretary had referred. He was not particularly interested in Clause 3, which seemed to him to deal with some compromise as to trade regulations between chemists and druggists. He was afraid that compromises were not much in favour just now; and they were apt to be made between two branches of a trade, as in this instance, without any real consideration for the interests of the public. The fact that a compromise had been made between the two branches of this particular trade—the chemists and the druggists—did not recommend the Bill to him. The really important part of the Bill was Clause 2. As he understood it, the clause did away with the restrictions that now existed with regard to the sale by tradesmen of sheep dips and other poisonous substances used for agricultural and horticultural purposes. Was there any other country in the world, except our own, which imposed so few restrictions on the sale of poisons of the sort referred to in the Bill? Why should the general health of the community be disregarded, and proper scientific precautions not be taken, and this widespread sale of poisonous substances be allowed, because it was a little more convenient to the farmer to get them from the nearest grocer's shop? It seemed to him that they were now proposing to give a very dangerous relaxation of the law with regard to the sale of poisons, such as would not be permitted in any other country, certainly not in France or Germany whose examples were so often quoted. A large class of people were required to qualify themselves by a long course of study and by obtaining University degrees after strict examination, before they could enter upon a certain business, in which they were entitled to certain privileges. Was it fair to those people to sweep away the whole system under which they had obtained those privileges simply because agricultural constituents of certain hon. Gentlemen would find it a little more convenient to have free trade in poisons carried on by ignorant persons? After all, would other professional people, like his friends who were members of the Bar, and their medical brethren who had passed severe examinations and qualified themselves for those professions, like the restrictions on the practice of their professions swept away, and be told that their work could be done equally well by unqualified men? Were these dangerous poisons to be spread over the country under the guise that they were useful for agricultural or horticultural purposes? He felt very strongly that the restrictions instead of being relaxed should be carefully guarded so as to prevent the ordinary uneducated man selling dangerous poisons, even on the ground that it would be a benefit to a particular industry such as agriculture. Clause 4 interfered with the existing provisions relating to the Pharmaceutical Society; it considerably modified its power of granting their certificates; and it would be convenient to know what other changes were proposed. The scientific qualifications and tests of professional skill were to be taken away, and instead, licences were to be granted by local authorities. Was it reasonable that the House should leave it to an Order in Council to say what was a local authority in which this very important power of granting a licence was to be vested? Parliament itself should lay down what was the local authority whose licence was to be in substitution for a scientific education. While he would not oppose the Second Reading of the Bill, he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would give the House time enough to consider these matters before they took the Bill in Committee.

*MR. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) thought there were certain provisions in the Bill which ought to be amended before it became an Act. Although the drug habit was increasing in this and all other countries, this Bill would not do much to interfere with it. It simply made it illegal that certain things should be sold except by a qualified chemist, but the whole mischief was the ease with which the latter could sell articles which were injurious to health. He was not sure that there was not greater harm in the drug habit than in the drink habit, but both were so harmful that it lay upon Members to do everything they could to restrict the sale of them. There was an article sold to-day called "chlorodyne" which was labelled "poison." When he was chairman of the largest asylum in London a poor creature was brought there who had taken large quantities of this mixture, very much to her detriment. He asked her how she got the stuff, and she said that it was true it was labelled "poison," but she could go to a chemist and although he would only sell her a bottle she could go on to other chemists and get more. Although the dose was only about twenty drops she had taken two or three teaspoonfuls many times a day, and of course it had the effect, which most of these drugs had, of turning her brain. He was hoping that the Government would introduce into a Bill of this kind provision making it more difficult for the general public to get drugs of a dangerous character. What often happened was that a patient got a doctor's prescription for morphia or some other drug of that character, and although it might be years old it was hawked about from chemist to chemist, and what was an excellent thing for the complaint the patient was suffering from at the time, proved most dangerous when it was taken permanently. Although the prescription was two or three years old the chemist would supply a bottle of it, and often the person producing the prescription said he was going to the South of France, or for a sea voyage, and he should like half-a-dozen bottles, and very often he got it. He knew of a person who had a prescription for chloral in rather heavy doses, and he had a great deal of trouble in getting a large quantity of it at a time, but the stores supplied half-a-dozen bottles on the plea that he was going yachting to Norway and Sweden. The person who obtained that quantity, he need not inform the House, was not any better for it when he came back. He was hoping that it would be quite possible for the Government to insert some clause to make it absolutely necessary that a doctor, in giving a prescription of a dangerous character containing a poison, should affix a date, and make it illegal for a chemist to dispense that dangerous drug after a month had elapsed. This was not merely his own opinion, but from repeated conversations with eminent medical men he knew that would be popular with the healing profession. The danger was now being rather accentuated by the putting up of most dangerous drugs in compressed or tabloid form, and people were using them because they could get them so easily. He had said before, and he repeated that he believed the love of drugs was as bad as that of drink and if they could get an opportunity restricting this traffic it was their duty to do it, and he believed that no measure would be more useful to the community than one which would make it more difficult to get the drugs which were so popular among the drug-taking fraternity. He entirely agreed with the last speaker as regarded the naming of the authority which should have this important duty put upon it under the Bill. He thought it should not be left to an Order in Council, but ought to be decided by the Government. He congratulated the parties to this dispute on coming to a fair compromise, but he hoped, before the Bill became an Act, some clause would be inserted which would make it more difficult for the drug-taking population to secure drugs, so that they should not get them with the same amount of ease with which they could get them now. Although it might not be known, he was sure that a very large portion of the misery and disease which certain classes of our population were suffering from to-day was owing to their having taken, at some time in their lives, drugs which did not show the bad effects at once; and in regard to the well-being of our people no measure would be of greater or wider use for the benefit of all than a measure which would restrict the facilities for getting these dangerous compounds. He did not think it was necessary for him to say anything more, except again to ask the Government to insert the local authority that should have cast upon it the important duty of giving a certificate to the person who might dispense these articles, and not leave it simply to the machinery of an Order in Council, under which different authorities might be named. He also hoped the Government would see their way to put something in the Bill to restrict the sale of those articles which were sapping away the lives and happiness of our people.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said it was quite correct that Clause 2 of the Bill made the sale of poisonous substances more free, but those who objected ignored apparently the exact state of the facts. All over large tracts of country the law, as it was at present, was set at defiance, and had been for years. He did not so much mean set at defiance as broken by general consent, owing to the enormous necessity for the supply of these drugs. What was the position? Hon. Members who lived in the country knew perfectly well that there were large districts in Ireland where the town was so small that a properly qualified druggist and chemist could not exist. Were they going to say to the poorer farmers in such districts that they should not be allowed to get sheep-dip and preparations of that kind? A substance which had not been mentioned, but which he thought ought to be mentioned, was sulphate of copper. There were hundreds of tons needed where no chemist was likely to have it. Sulphate of copper was required for spraying potatoes, and it was sold in every store in every country town. The result had been that in large districts of the country the Act of 1868 had been for many years a dead letter, and these necessary poisons were sold for the convenience of everybody. It was recognised by everyone that convenience must override the law. He was stating what was an absolute fact; and, therefore, he thought the Government were perfectly right in bringing the law into harmony with the facts of the case. He thought the Government, so far from curtailing the rights given under Section 2, ought to extend them to all these substances which were commonly used by the country people for the destruction of fungi, or for sheep-dips, or spraying potatoes or fruit trees. He thought all these ought to be included under Section 2, and it ought not to be left to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council to investigate this question. What was the use of leaving the Lord-Lieutenant to inquire whether sulphate of copper was useful when everybody knew it was? Clause 2 was an absolute necessity for the convenience of the rural districts, and in those districts cases of poisoning were exceedingly rare. Whenever there was a case it was generally rat-poison that was used, and seldom anything else. Clause 2 did not apply to rat-poison or anything containing strychnine. He thought the clause was necessary, and hoped the Government would stick to it.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said that owing to this Bill being brought on them at short notice, it was very difficult for some of them who were interested in the subject, and who represented another part of Ireland than that represented by the hon. Member who had just sat down, to deal with the matter. At the same time, they were entrusted with the task of trying to elicit from the Minister in charge of the Bill what compromise had been concluded with regard to the chemists and druggists in Ireland. He understood from the new clause read out that it only referred to chemists and druggists in England and Scotland, but anyone who turned to the end of the Bill would see that a certain portion of the measure applied to Ireland, and he understood that great dissatisfaction had been evinced among certain sections of the chemists in that country with regard to Clauses 2 and 3. The Under-Secretary, in reading out the new clause, made no mention whatever of how it would be affected by Clause 7, which said that the provisions of this Act, relative to the regulation and sale of certain poisonous substances for agricultural and horticultural purposes, and to restrictions on the sale of certain mineral acids, should apply to Ireland with certain modifications. Clause 2 dealt chiefly with the poisons which were used in the production of agricultural articles—sheep dip, and so on, and it would be found there that so much of the Pharmacy Act, 1868, as made it an offence for any person to sell or keep open a shop for the sale of poisons, unless he was a duly registered pharmaceutical chemist or chemist and druggist, and conformed to the regulations under Section 1 of that Act, should not apply to poisonous substances containing certain materials, such as arsenic, tobacco or alkaloids of tobacco, to be used exclusively in agriculture or horticulture. Clause 2 was rather obscure, in so far that the Act to which it referred, the Act of 1868, had twenty-eight clauses, and in considering Clause 2 of this Bill it was necessary to go through the whole of the Act of 1868 to see what portion of it referred to the sale of these poisons. That, taken by itself, was a matter of considerable labour, but, in the circumstances under which this Bill was introduced, it was an absolute impossibility. He would like to ask, was Ireland included in the compromise referred to?

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the later clause affecting the position of chemist and druggist companies did not affect Ireland.

CAPTAIN CRAIG replied that if that were so, a large section of the chemists of Ireland thoroughly objected to the Bill. He had understood that some arrangement had been come to by which Clause 3 would be extended to Ireland. If that was so, it would be acceptable to the chemists. The only part of the Bill which referred to Ireland was Clause 2 and a part of Clause 6 referring solely to the sale of articles connected with agriculture and horticulture. If only Clause 2 was applicable to Ireland, he would like to ask whether there was anything in the Bill to allow the right of sale to be extended to those who were connected solely with horticulture and agriculture in Ireland. There was a grievance touching these great seedsmen and rose-growers and fruit-growers, having the right to sell the various articles enumerated in Clause 2, which affect their particular branch of horticulture. They had an expert knowledge in the cure of the various diseases from which fruit trees and other things suffered. In the readjustment of the Bill, before it came to the Committee stage, he hoped the Government would make some arrangement whereby these large and established firms would be able to sell these articles, which they were able from their expert knowledge to certify were the best remedies for the diseases to which he had referred. He would like to know also whether it was not the fact that certain restrictions were to be put on those who had sold these potato sprays and sheep dips in Ireland, because in some of the out-of-the-way districts in Ireland some restriction ought to be put in force. The danger was in those districts, not where these things were sold in packets, but where they were supplied in smaller quantities, where packets were broken up, perhaps by a small child of the shopkeeper, in which case some of this poisonous material might be left on the counter in close proximity to food and other articles of consumption. He had been told that the restriction to be placed on the sale of these articles would take the line that they would not be allowed to be sold in any shop where food or drink was sold. But whether that suggestion had been accepted by the Government he had not been informed. The hon. Member for East Mayo had spoken quite truly when he had stated that in certain out-of-the-way parts of Ireland there was not a certified chemist within reasonable distance. But even where there was, the prices charged by the registered chemist for these articles were much higher than those charged by the druggist. Co-operative societies also had sprung up and grown rapidly in Ireland during the past few years, and they claimed a right to be allowed to sell these articles, done up in tins, bottles or parcels, in their particular localities. Although the Bill, so far as Clause 2 was concerned, was of as much interest to Ireland as to any other part of the United Kingdom, not one word, in the course of two hours discussion, had been said by Ministers as to how it affected Ireland. He really thought that the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland, who, he understood, had charge of that part of the Bill, should have been in his place and given the House some enlightenment on that matter. He did not oppose the Bill, and should not divide against the Second Reading, but unless some explanation was given he hoped some of his friends would oppose it and insist on the Vice-President being sent for immediately.

*Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL said that most of the points which had been raised were such as could only be settled in Committee, and it was obviously impossible for him to discuss them that day. With regard to the general principle of Clause 2, it was one of the most important clauses in the Bill. The purpose of that clause was not to impose restrictions on the sale of weed-killers and sheep-dips to farmers, but, as he said in moving the Second Reading, to enable agriculturists and horticulturists to get those articles which contained poisons more freely than they were now able legally to do. Ironmongers and others who now sold those commodities did so illegally, and were liable to prosecution at any time. Although in recent years few prosecutions had taken place, yet between 1896 and 1901 there were 749 prosecutions by the Pharmaceutical Society, mainly, he believed, in cases of this character. In some parts of England the sale of these articles was restricted absolutely to chemists through those prosecutions. Under the Bill, other persons who were to sell these commodities were to be licensed and were to conform to the requirements of the Act.

Viscount HELMSLEY asked if the restriction would apply to the sale of patent medicines which were specially excluded from the Act of 1868.

*Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL said they did not come within the purview of the clause. Clause 2 dealt only with those commodities which were used for agriculture, and which contained particular poisons as ingredients, such as arsenic, tobacco, and alkaloids of tobacco. The precarious position of the present sellers of these poisonous materials for agricultural purposes must be dealt with. On the one hand, it was obvious that they ought to extend the existing legal facilities. He thought that all Members of the House must agree to that. Even the Member for the Scottish Universities, when he came to consider the matter more closely, especially if he read the Report of the Departmental Committee of 1901, could not fail to come to that conclusion. On the other hand, it would be very inadvisable to throw open the sale of poisonous materials, some of them very poisonous, to all and sundry without any restriction at all. Therefore they proposed to require a double check. One was that the local authority should license the trader who was to sell these materials, so that only persons of repute who could be properly trusted to take precautions should get these licences; and, secondly, these poisonous materials were only to be sold in accordance with the regulations which were to be made by Order in Council for the safeguard of their storage and use.

AN HON. MEMBER: What local authority?

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the local authority was to be determined by Order in Council, but it would be carefully considered whether it would be possible to insert a precise designation of the local authority in the Bill. He would consult with his right hon. friend the Lord President of the Council on this matter. This was not a Home Office Bill; it was a Privy Council Bill, and he was speaking not as Under-Secretary for the Home Office, but as representative in that House of that Department. The hon. Member for Mayo had said that this Clause 2 ought to be enlarged, and that the poisons which were specified there should be added to, and he had mentioned one or two materials which were sold for use in agriculture. By an Order in Council other materials, which at any time might be brought into use for those purposes, could be added to those specified in Clause 2 of the Bill. He hoped that he had made it quite clear that it was not intended to restrict farmers in obtaining these articles, but to enable them to do so more easily, and this had been warmly welcomed by chambers of agriculture throughout the country. The hon. Member for Blackpool brought up the question of morphia. This Bill did make a change in the law; it took morphia out of Part II. of the Schedule of the Pharmacy Act of 1868, and put it into Part I., and thereby further restrained its sale. It might be said that the whole of the Pharmacy Acts ought to be amended so as greatly to increase the restrictions on substances such as these. That was a question which ought to be dealt with, if at all, after inquiry and with the aid of expert knowledge, but all the restrictions provided by the existing law which applied to the most deadly poisons, like prussic acid for example, would now be applied to the sale of morphia. The hon. Member had asked him how far the Bill applied to Ireland, and whether the compromise arrived at with regard to Clause 3 would extend to that country. Ireland had its own code of Pharmacy Acts, and the Pharmacy Acts which they were amending did not apply to Ireland at all. They had their own Orders in Council made by the Irish Privy Council. His right hon. friend did not originally propose to apply the Bill to Ireland; but there was a great desire on the part of Irish agriculturists that Clause 2 should be extended to their country, and it was in accordance with that desire that that extension was made. Clause 5, which dealt with comparatively small points, also applied to Ireland. Clause 3 which dealt with the vexed question of companies which were chemists and druggists, did not apply to Ireland, and communications consequently had not passed between the Government and the chemists and druggists and the companies of Ireland as in England. It would be difficult, he did not say impossible, to adapt the Irish Pharmacy Acts to the purposes of the Bill. It would mean legislation by reference of a complicated kind. But if it was desired that Clause 3 should apply to Ireland, he would be happy to take representations on the point into consideration. There had been communications with the Irish Government, but he was not convinced that there was the same agreement in Ireland as in England with regard to Clause 3. He need hardly say, however, that if there was a general desire among Irish representatives that the clause should be extended to Ireland, with the necessary modifications, of course, the Government would be very glad indeed to do all in its power to meet their wishes. The Government's own desire was to arrive at a general agreement of this character. The adaptation to this particular Bill of the Irish Pharmacy Acts would be a matter of much complexity, and hon. Members must not complain if the clause consisted of legislation by reference of a somewhat complicated character; that would be inevitable. The noble Lord the Member for Chorley had asked how far there was a real compromise in England, and had suggested that the compromise was on the basis of vague conversations which might break down. When the Government had drafted the clause it was submitted to the various parties. He held in his hand three letters with reference to this matter. He submitted the clause as proposed by the Government to the organised representatives of the various parties, and he had a communication from the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain saying that they would agree to the clause as it would stand when the suggested Amendments were inserted; and he had a letter from the Companies Chemists Association, which included the Army and Navy Stores, the Junior Army and Navy, Harrod's, Spiers and Pond's, Boots' Cash Chemists, and all the other protagonists in this fight, and also a letter from the Co-operative Union, which represented the co-operative societies of England and Wales. The whole of these bodies unanimously accepted without any reservation whatever the clause as it would be when amended by the Government proposals. The hon. Member for Inverness had suggested that the House should have an opportunity to consider the precise terms of the compromise. He would hand in Amendments to-night in order that they might appear on the Order Paper tomorrow, and in ample time for the Committee stage. He thought that this Bill, which was of a technical and detailed character, would properly be dealt with by a Standing Committee rather than by the Committee of the Whole House. He had no doubt that the Standing Committee would consider it in a spirit of goodwill and with a desire to pass the Bill. It was a measure which raised no element of party controversy. He thought that all sections of the House desired to see an end put to this long standing dispute, and he trusted that, as the Bill had already passed the House of Lords, before very many days had elapsed it would have passed through the House of Commons.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said he agreed that it was most undesirable that these preparations sold for the purposes of agriculture should continue to be sold by persons in defiance of the law. But there was another class they must think of at the same time, namely, those people who had the right to sell these sheep dips and potato spraying mixtures to agriculturists, and who had actually been disposing of them in various districts for many years. It would be a very serious thing, when this Bill passed, if anybody might be allowed to sell these commodities in their immediate neighbourhood. It would be an interference with what had been an undoubted monopoly of qualified persons—a monopoly which they had enjoyed for many years, and out of which no doubt, they had made a very good income. There was no doubt that such persons ought to be considered. He was not content to leave entirely to the local authority, especially as they had not been informed what that local authority was, the absolute right to say whether or not any person should be allowed to sell these things. He was sorry to say that no matter what the measure was, if it applied to Ireland, politics and religion were sure to enter into its administration. And he could quite realise the case in which a local authority, say a rural district council, if it were fixed upon as the authorty who was to have the administration of this Act, might decide that a certain individual should have the right to sell these materials, and so perhaps pay off an old score against the person who up to then had been the only one who had had the right to sell these commodities.

There should be some stringent provisions for regulating that part of the measure. He thought also that where an individual was refused a licence he ought to have the right of appeal to some tribunal which he might consider more impartial than the local authority. He objected very strongly to the extensive powers which were left in the hands of the Privy Council. There was the further objection that the regulations which they framed were to be laid on the Table of the House, so that there might be an opportunity of considering them. So far as that safeguard was concerned, it might as well be left out of the Bill altogether. As had been pointed out by hon. Gentlemen on his side of the House, everything that was done under the Bill was handed over *en bloc* to the Privy Council. They had become accustomed to this kind of legislation; none the less he thought that it was extremely harmful and retrograde. There were many things in these subsections which he was firmly convinced ought to be kept in the hands of the House. For instance, the regulations as regarded the granting of licences: he thought that the House, and not the Privy Council, ought to lay down the various classes of persons to whom these licences should be given. He certainly thought the House should fix definitely what the local authority was to be, which should have the carrying out of the Act. He desired that the Bill should pass into law, because in theory, at any rate, there was nothing contentious about it, but he would ask the right hon. Gentleman again to consider before the Committee stage whether he could not, with the assistance of the draughtsman who had so skilfully drafted that gem of draughtsmanship, sub-clause (*a*) of Clause 6, a gem in the way of legislation by reference, include the compromise which had been arrived at on Clause 3. This was a very excellent opportunity of trying to clear up the differences and difficulties which had existed quite as much in Ireland as in this country. It was hardly reasonable to complain of the non-attendance of any Minister to answer for the Irish part of the Bill, but at any rate they had a grievance, inasmuch as they had no one on the Treasury bench who could give them any information whatever with reference to what it was intended to do on the various points which applied to Ireland alone. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give them ample time, before the Bill went into Committee, to communicate with interested parties and formulate Amendments, and that there would be full discussion in Committee and on Report.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed to a Standing Committee.

WHITE PHOSPHORUS MATCHES PROHIBITION BILL.

As amended (in the Standing Committee) considered.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey) moved to omit Clause 1, for the purpose of obtaining a little more information with regard to the necessity of the Bill. He had already been informed in answer to a Question that there were ten factories in this country at which white phosphorus was used in the manufacture of matches, and that there were only five cases of necrosis during the past five years, all of which occurred in one particular factory. As nine out of ten factories using white phosphorus had, therefore, been absolutely free from cases of necrosis for five years the occurrence of the disease entirely in one factory must have been due to negligence either on the part of those concerned in the factory or on the part of the inspectors whose duty it was to see that safeguards were put in force. One of the main objects, he gathered from the Memorandum accompanying the Bill, was to enable this country to join the Berne Convention. He believed there was no material benefit to be gained by going into the Convention, and supposed that the object was really a sentimental one. But had it occurred to the Home Secretary that those who were urging the passing of the Bill had not altogether foreseen what the result would be if it became law? The object of the Bill was to prevent recurrence of cases of necrosis, a disease which was preventible already. A result which would probably follow from the Bill would be the creation of a large trust among match manufacturers, because the Bill would prohibit the importation of all matches in the manufacture of which white phosphorus was used. It also appeared from the Memorandum that these manufacturers had agreed to the Bill. It must have occurred to the Government that these manufacturers would reap an advantage by increasing the price to the consumer. Were there any reasons for other countries not having joined the Berne Convention —Russia and Austria, for instance ?

*MR. SPEAKER: The noble Lord is not entitled to discuss the whole Bill on the first clause. He must confine himself to the first clause. He is now making a Second Reading speech.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY said his vote on whether to leave the clause out or not was dependent on the reasons which were given for retaining it. He was only anxious to know what the real necessity was for our joining the Berne Convention. If he could get the information he had asked for he would be very glad to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. HICKS BEACH, in seconding, asked what were the reasons explained in Memorandum Cd. 3271 of 1906 why the Government at that time were not able to agree to the Berne Convention. He had done his best to find a copy of that interesting document, but there appeared to be only one in existence, and that was in the possession of the late Home Secretary. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would tell them what had actually transpired since 1906 which had enabled the Government now to enter the Convention, and to bring in a Bill of this kind. He thought his noble friend had brought forward one or two strong points against he necessity of bringing in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Earl of Ronaldshay.*)

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.) said the chief reason for the Bill was the desire absolutely to eliminate the danger from necrosis. It was true that few cases had occurred during the last few years, but he thought that immunity had been secured only by great trouble and continual watchfulness, and they could not say that they were safe from an outbreak. The question could not be dealt with by legislation just after the Berne Convention. At that time they hoped to be able to proceed entirely by fresh regulations, and those regulations were taken in hand; but difficulties were encountered, and it was evident that fresh rules could not be imposed without serious cost to the trade. When that became evident the regulations dropped, because they saw it would be a simpler matter to deal with the question by Bill. A second material point was that there were certain patent rights in existence, and they could not prohibit importation, and thereby give undue advantage to two or three manufacturers at the expense of the rest. The result of their communications with the manufacturers on this point was entirely satisfactory. Those who were interested in existing patents undertook to give to the other manufacturers the use of those patents at a nominal figure which was merely a recognition of the patent rights, and in regard to any future manufacture that might come into existence, they undertook to give the patent rights at nearly a nominal price. That disarmed suspicion by itself. The Board of Trade had ample power of control under the Bill to secure to any manufacturer free and proper use at a reasonable price of those patent rights. In the circumstances there was no possible danger arising from the formation of combinations of manufacturers. So far as the general necessity for the Bill was concerned, it was desirable, though he admitted there had been few cases lately of necrosis poisoning, if they could do it, absolutely to eliminate the chance of this very dreadful and painful disease occurring. It was so dreadful that, even if only one case had occurred in the last few years, this Bill, which would involve no trouble or expense, would be justified. The Bill was supported in every part of the House, and he hoped it would be allowed to pass.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) said that after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman he would not detain the House many minutes. He did not think it was unreasonable that his noble friend should have asked the right hon. Gentleman to make the reply he had done. The Opposition raised no objection to the Second Reading, thinking it was universally accepted, and they were anxious to get forward with the measure. On that occasion, they obtained an understanding that the right hon. Gentleman would not think them unreasonable if they asked two or three questions when the Bill came forward in the House. He understood that the Home Office thought prohibition was absolutely necessary to stop this painful disease of necrosis or phossy jaw. The late Lord Ritchie, after an exhaustive inquiry, imposed upon manufactories where white phosphorus was used, stringent conditions as to ventilation, cleanliness and periodical inspection, and, besides that, he caused the dangerous processes to be separated. When he himself was at the Home Office those regulations had had the effect of almost suppressing the disease in this country, and there were only five cases in the year 1904, and three of those were very mild, whilst the other two were caused entirely because the operatives would not obey the regulations laid down. In 1906 there were no such cases at all, and he did not understand that there had been any recurrence of the disease. There was some little criticism in the year 1905 when there was a Convention sitting at Berne. At that time, as the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean knew, there was a Foreign Office objection to proceeding with this measure, and he wished to know whether Japan agreed to the present Convention. With regard to the second Convention, upon which the present Under-Secretary was the representative of this country, he gathered that the representatives were unanimous in the decision they had come to. He would like to ask the Under-Secretary what action was taken by Japan and the United States, and whether the latter intended to carry out prohibition in that country. That would have a considerable effect upon the manufacturers of this country, and he believed that was the reason why the right hon. Gentleman had thought it better that there should be a total prohibition of the landing of matches made with this substance from other countries. He did not know that this House would disagree with a policy of that kind, and they might wish to see it carried much further. All he wanted to know was what were the terms under which ordinary British manufacturers not in the "circle" could obtain patent rights. He shared his noble friend's alarm that some trust might be formed, which might be a disadvantage to the best interest of their manufacturers at home. It would be open to them at a later stage, if they were not satisfied, to ask further questions as to the terms made with other Powers.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said he was somewhat surprised at any opposition to a Bill of this kind, and more especially at the Motion made by the noble Lord.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he had already pointed out that the Opposition allowed this Bill to pass the Second Reading unopposed on the understanding that they would be afforded opportunities for discussion at a later stage. He denied that the Opposition were opposing the Bill.

MR. SUMMERBELL said under those circumstances he would withdraw what he had said upon that point. Even if there had been only one case they ought to make an effort to prevent this terrible disease recurring. A most extraordinary statement had been made by the noble Lord, in which he said a Bill of this character would prevent the importation of matches, and that prohibition would give a monopoly to British manufacturers which would inevitably result in an increase in the cost of matches to the consumer at home. That was an extraordinary statement, and he only wished to emphasise it in view of future discussions.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Earl of RONALDSHAY moved an Amendment to Clause 2 (Prohibition of Sale) providing that the prohibition of the sale of white phosphorus matches by any retail dealer should not come into operation until 1st January, 1912, instead of 1911. The object of the Amendment, he said, was to enable retail dealers who had large stocks of these matches to have a little time to dispose of them. He thought this was an Amendment which the Government would consider was reasonable, because if it were accepted it would not in any way interfere with the efficiency of the Bill. It might put off for one year the time when they would attach their signatures to the Berne Convention but that ought not to trouble them very much. He would like to give a reason why he thought the time allowed for retailers getting rid of their stocks of matches was not sufficient. They liked to have wrappers on the boxes upon which their own name was printed, and any other advertisement of their own; and they could only secure those particular wrappers by giving very large orders. He believed that the ordinary order necessary to secure such wrappers was something like ten gross of boxes. To a man not doing a very large business it was impossible for him to dispose of that property in two years. He believed that the Under-Secretary was of opinion that, generally speaking, two years would be sufficient for retailers to dispose of their stock, but his information was of a contrary nature, and the right hon. Gentleman would find that many retailers in his own constituency would be ready to support what he had said. He did not know this Bill was coming on so early, or he could have given many proofs that these retailers would not be able to get rid of their stocks within the time allowed. He had received a telegram from a grocer at Peterborough stating that he had a stock of these matches which he could not dispose of at the present rate of business under less than three years. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] Hon. Members below the gangway apparently were not conversant with the grocery trade.

Mr. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he was conversant with the grocery trade, and had spent twenty years in it.

Earl of RONALDSHAY said that in the case of this particular grocer three years would be required before he was able to dispose of the stock he had in hand. There would be no risk in accepting this Amendment, and it would not impair the efficiency of the Bill, therefore he could not see what possible objection there could be to it. The importation of these matches was to be prohibited, and also their manufacture. Consequently, the sale of them would cease by the natural course of events. There was another hardship which would be inflicted upon the retail traders. Under the Explosives Act railways were not allowed to charge less than 5s. or 6s. upon any consignments of matches. In order to be able to defray the expense of carriage under these conditions it was necessary they should order matches in large quantities, otherwise they would not make any profit on them. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept this Amendment, otherwise he would feel bound to press the matter to a division. He begged to move.

Mr. HICKS BEACH, in seconding the Amendment, said the case put by his hon. friend was worthy of consideration. There were people who would suffer hardship if the proposal in the Bill were carried in its present form. What possible harm could it do to extend the period? The whole object of the Bill was to prevent disease arising from the use of white phosphorus, and it appeared to him that the extension of the period for one year could do no possible harm. That would enable retailers to get rid of the stocks which they had laid in. He would support the Amendment unless the Home Secretary could give some valid reason for not extending the period.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, to leave out the word 'eleven,' and to insert the word 'twelve.'"—(*Earl of Ronaldshay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'eleven' stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. GLADSTONE said that in consequence of representations made by the trade an extension of time to 1911 was given in Committee, and now the Government were quite satisfied that the trade as a whole were entirely satisfied with the Bill as it stood.

Earl of RONALDSHAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman say what is the objection to extending the time?

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The objection is that it is really not necessary.

Mr. HICKS BEACH: Would it have any detrimental effect with respect to this country becoming a signatory to the Berne Convention?

Mr. RUPERT GUINNESS (Shoreditch, Haggerston) pressed for an extension of the time on behalf of small grocers. He had received some representations on their behalf, and he thought the proposal in the Bill would operate unfairly in regard to them.

*Mr. GLADSTONE asked whether the representations had been received since the Committee stage of the Bill.

Mr. RUPERT GUINNESS said he had received them within the last few days. The people for whom he pleaded had to buy their matches in large quantities, and it took a considerable time to get rid of the stocks.

Lord BALCARRES expressed the hope that his hon. friend would not press the Amendment. He did not believe that grocers were going to suffer to any great extent. It was only in exceptional cases that phosphorus matches were stored in grocers' shops. In trying to protect the small grocer, they might inflict this potential danger on everybody else in the trade. At present the whole of the match trade was in exceptional difficulty, having severe regulations hanging over its head. The extension of the time would inflict great expense and consequent hardship on the trade, and, therefore, he hoped that the operation of the Bill would not be postponed.

Amendment negatived.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be now read a third time,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL. [H.L.]

Order for the Second Reading read.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) moved the Second Reading of this Bill, which, he said, had come down from the Lords. The object of the measure, he explained, was to enable the Privy Council and the Court of Appeal to receive the assistance of Judges who were available for the purpose without any creation of new Judges. The first clause would enable a Colonial Judge to act as assessor of the Judicial Committee on the hearing of appeals from a Colony. This applied only to cases where the services of such Judges happened to be available, and enabled the Privy Council to avail themselves of their services in proper cases. Then there were Indian Judges who were happily often in this country and retired Judges who had served in a High Court in British India, and whose assistance would be of great benefit to the Privy Council. The second section accordingly enabled His Majesty to direct that such Judges might be made members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This applied only to those Judges who had already the distinction of being privy councillors. Another section provided that the Lord Chancellor might request any Judge of the High Court in England to sit as an additional Judge of the Court of Appeal.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir W. Robson.*)

LORD BALCARRES said he understood that under this Bill it would be possible for one of the assessors to be a Judge who had already adjudicated in a case.

SIR W. ROBSON said that Clause 4 referred to the Supreme Court of Judicature Act of 1875, and that provision would prevent what the hon. Member alluded to.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House, for To-morrow.—(*Sir. W. Robson.*)

COMPANIES CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS asked whether they were to have no explanation at all. He wanted to know whether the Bill had been before a Select Committee or the Law Officers of the Crown. There were a large number of clauses in the Bill, and he would like to get an assurance on that point.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee) said the Bill was simply a consolidation Bill, reproducing the law at present expressed in eighteen different statutes. It had been considered by a Joint Committee of a most representative and authoritative character.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

ASSIZES AND QUARTER SESSIONS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

Privilege Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, considered; Bill read the third time and passed with an Amendment.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. J. A. PEASE, Essex, Saffron Walden), in moving the Adjournment of the House, said that in the possible event of the Education Bill not being proceeded with, which he thought improbable, the Government proposed to proceed on Friday with the Port of London Bill.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) asked if the Government did proceed with the Education Bill would they go on straight with Clause 3?

MR. J. A. PEASE: That is certainly the intention.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nineteen minutes after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 4th December, 1908.

The House met at Twelve Noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 9th November, 1908, and entitled the "Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs (General, Regulations, 1908" [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of an Order, No. 7617, dated 28th November, 1908, prohibiting the landing of Animals from the States of Maryland and Delaware, in the United States of America [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

Copy presented, of Instructions to Inspectors, dated 12th November, 1908, supplemental to the Instructions dated 9th March, 1906, issued by the Estates Commissioners under the Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant, dated 5th March, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ROADS AND BRIDGES (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 7th July; *Mr. Erskine*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 347.]

EAST INDIA (CUSTOMS REVENUE).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 25th November; *Mr. Harold Cox*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 348.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Return showing the total number of Pupils on 1st October, 1907, in the Schools and Centres included in the List of Secondary Schools in England recognised as efficient, and of recognised Pupil Teacher Centres, 1907–8 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906 (INDUSTRIAL DISEASES).

Copy presented, of Order, dated 2nd December, 1908, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 8 (6) of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, extending to certain Industrial Diseases the provisions of Section 8 (subject to modifications) and amending the previous Order of 22nd May, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS ABROAD.

Copy presented, of Reports from Colonial Governors, the Government of India, and His Majesty's Representatives Abroad on Laws and Regulations in force in British Colonies and Possessions in British India and in Foreign Countries respecting the Registration of Commercial Firms [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Board of Trade under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Syllabuses—The Apostles' Creed.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will say what is the proportion of local education authorities that include the Apostles' Creed in their syllabus of religious instruction to be given under the Cowper-Temple Clause.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I regret I can only refer the hon. Member to the Return of Religious Instruction in Council Schools, issued by the Board of Education in 1906 (No. 115). In a considerable number of areas the syllabus varies in individual schools, and it is not possible to give accurate particulars of the number in which the Apostles' Creed is included.

Voluntary School Grants.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether it is the intention of the Government in the Education Bill now before the House to repeal Section 97 of the Education Act of 1870, which enacts that the grants to provided and to voluntary schools shall be on the same scale; and, if not, whether the grants proposed to be made to schools that contract out, as set forth in the First Schedule, will be made also to council schools; and, if it is the intention of the Government that the grants as set out in the First Schedule of the Bill shall not apply to the council schools, can he state what proposals the Government proposes to make as regards the annual grants to council schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) This Question does not now arise.

School Teachers' Salaries—Proportion per Child.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state what was the average sum per child spent by local education authorities on salaries in elementary provided schools, in voluntary schools, and in all elementary schools during the year ending 31st March, 1907, in London, the county boroughs, London and the county boroughs taken together, and throughout the country; and whether he can give the like information with regard to each of the other items (rates being, however, distinguished from taxes and insurance) shown on page 2 of the White Paper [Cd. 4406] of this year.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*)

Salaries of Teachers.	London.	County Boroughs.	London and County Boroughs.	England and Wales.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
Staff of council schools - - -	72 4	52 11	59 8	54 2
Staff of voluntary schools -	53 10	49 7	50 6	48 7
Other teachers - - -	3 1	1 4	1 9	0 11
Total - - - - - -	71 1	52 11	58 3	52 7

In the figures given above the staff of higher elementary schools are included. With regard to the latter part of the hon. Member's Question, the remaining items cannot be shown separately for voluntary and council schools, and in some cases cannot be separated from each other. I am considering whether accurate figures as to any of the headings can be obtained. It is in any case impossible to distinguish rates from taxes and insurance.

Royal Naval Reserve—Case of Alfred Rutherford of Leeds.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the case of Alfred Rutherford, of Leeds, who has served twenty-three and a half years as a member of the Royal Naval Reserve, but is now in ill-health, suffering from heart affection; and, if so, can he state whether it is the intention of his Department to grant him the pension which is due to him.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) From 10th March, 1903, to 30th September, 1907, Alfred Rutherford was in receipt of a pension of £12 a year, which was granted on the ground that he was wholly incapacited from contributing to his own support. When surveyed in July, 1907, with a view to the renewal of the pension, he was reported to be materially able so to contribute, and it was stated that he had obtained employment as a verger. No further award of pension could be made under the regulations governing the Royal Naval Reserve, which restrict the grant of a pension in the case of men under sixty to those who are pronounced, upon medical examination, wholly and permanently incapacitated from earning a livelihood, provided that such incapacity is not due to their own imprudence or misconduct. If he is now unable to maintain himself, he should make application to the local registrar, Royal Naval Reserve, who will cause him to be again medically surveyed with a view to the reconsideration of his case.

Collection of Tea-cess by Indian Government.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that for many years the Ceylon tea planters have been paying, at their own request, a tax collected by the Government for pushing the sale of Ceylon teas in new markets, especially in America; that at the instigation of a few people or a very small minority, that is, 4 against 70 tea planters, Lord Elgin gave notice that the cess must cease; that this decision created consternation among the people connected with the planting enterprise; whether he is aware that three years ago the Indian tea planters, realising the benefits accruing to Ceylon by this cess or self-imposed taxation, started one of a similar character, and its collection has been allowed for five years more, viz., to 1913; whether, seeing that His Excellency the Governor of Ceylon has written a despatch urging His Majesty's Government to allow the Ceylon planters to continue the payment of this taxation, in view of the benefits derived therefrom, he will say what answer has the Secretary of State given to the appeal of the Governor; and whether he has any objection to lay the correspondence upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) Lord Elgin decided in October, 1906, that the collection of the tea-cess by the Government must cease at the end of 1908. This decision was taken on the ground that a substantial minority of the persons interested in the tea industry objected to the tax, and that it was difficult to defend a law which at the wish of the majority of a class taxed a dissenting minority for purposes essentially in the nature of private enterprise. The Secretary of State sees no sufficient cause for reversing his predecessor's decision. It will, of course, be open to the majority to raise the funds which they think necessary without the intervention of the Government. I may observe that the vote of 70 against 4 to which the hon. Member refers was apparently a vote of the Ceylon Planters' Association in February last, whereas Lord Elgin's decision was taken in October, 1906, as I have already explained, and was prompted by the objections of a considerable number of persons and companies interested in the tea industry, of whom many are not resident in Ceylon, and therefore do not vote at meetings of the Planters' Association. It is not proposed to lay Papers upon the subject.

Old-Age Pensions Regulations.

Mr. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a man seventy years of age otherwise entitled to a pension is debarred from receiving one if his wife is in receipt of parish relief, even if she is in the workhouse or its hospital owing to mental infirmity.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) If the wife were in receipt of ordinary poor relief the husband would be disqualified for receiving a pension, but the disqualification would not apply if the relief afforded to the wife were confined to maintenance in an infirmary, or to such medical or surgical assistance as is excluded by the proviso to paragraph (*a*) of Section 3 of the Old-Age Pensions Act.

Charge for Annual Revision of County Westmeath.

Sir WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the facts that the area of County Westmeath is 442,370 acres, number of townlands 1,346, and total valuation, £327,323; the area of County Meath is 577,734 acres, number of townlands, 1,625, and total valuation, £538,203; cost of revision for County Westmeath, £170;

cost of revision for County Meath, £180; he will furnish the Westmeath County Council with the information they have asked for as to how the charge for the annual revision of the said county is arrived at.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I would refer the hon. Baronet to the Answer of my predecessor of 2nd April last. I understand that the amount of work to be done in a county during the annual revision does not depend either on the area or the number of townlands, nor yet on the total valuation.

Compulsory Attendance at Contracted-out Schools.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the school attendance officer will have the same power to take steps to enforce the attendance at contracted-out schools, under the Elementary Education Bill (No. 2), as he now possesses in respect of provided schools in England and Wales.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) This Question does not now arise.

Sale of Impure Whiskey at Irish Fairs.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in tents and booths at races and fairs, for which the Justices in Ireland grant occasional licences, a compound, largely composed of sulphuric acid, known in the West of Ireland as fair whiskey, is largely sold and is very injurious to His Majesty's subjects; and will he take steps to secure that some of the vendors are prosecuted by the police under the Food and Drugs Act or other relevant statutes.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that it is sometimes alleged that a compound such as is referred to is sold as whisky at fairs and races in Ireland, but, so far as he is aware, no proof of the correctness of such allegations has ever been forthcoming.

Arbitrator's Charges at Carrick-on-Suir.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the members of the Carrick-on-Suir (No. 2) District Council consider the account furnished to them by the arbitrator for expenses incurred by him in awarding compensation in the cases of acquiring sites unopposed by landlords or occupiers under the Labourers Acts as extravagant, having regard to the work to be done and the fact that the sites to be visited were in a comparatively limited area; whether the arbitrator charged for fifteen and a half days' time exclusive of sustenance allowance, travelling expenses, printing, typing, postage, etc.; and whether local authorities are compelled to pay expenses claimed by Local Government arbitrators or officials if they consider such claims excessive.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The facts are as stated in the Question. The Local Government Board inform me that the amount which the Board, after full consideration of the council's objections, certified as payable by the council, is reasonable, having regard to the work done and is not above the average for a scheme of the size in question. The amount mentioned in the certificate issued by the Board as to the costs, charges, and expenses incurred in the matter is a debt due from the local authority to the Crown in pursuance of Article 28 of the Second Schedule of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890.

Irish Local Government Board Surcharges.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state in how many cases the Local Government Board have proceeded for surcharges against presiding chairmen of local public bodies in Ireland for the years 1905–6–7; what was the amount claimed in each year named; in how many cases were proceedings prosecuted outside of the district where the alleged offence took place; has his attention been drawn to proceedings last week against Thomas Shannon, Vice-Chairman of the Bawnboy Rural District Council, in the city of Belfast; were the surcharges sued for two items of 8s. and £1 4s., being for relief granted to a woman suffering from paralysis and to a household in a poverty-stricken mountainous district where there was illness and children starving; did the auditor inquire into the circumstances and did the magistrate refuse to take evidence on this point; and whether, in view of the effect of the prevailing surcharge provisions, he will have the whole matter reviewed with a view to having this matter put right, even by legislation if necessary.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The duties of the Local Government Board in regard to surcharges are confined to deciding upon any appeals duly made to the Board against them. It is upon the auditor that the duty of recovering surcharges is imposed by statute, both in cases where no appeal is taken against the surcharge and where they have been confirmed on appeal either by the Board or by the King's Bench. The Board have no record of the number of instances in which payment of the surcharges has been refused and the auditors have been obliged to have recourse to legal proceedings for their recovery. In the majority of cases, however, in which surcharges are made upon members of local authorities the members surcharged are those who authorised the expenditure surcharged, and the presiding chairman would be included among such persons. As regards the case of Thomas Shannon, the surcharges of 8s. and £1 4s. were in respect of the cost of outdoor relief afforded to the wives of two farmers who were each in occupation of twenty acres of land. The auditor, before making these surcharges, fully inquired into the circumstances of the cases. No appeal was made against them, and he proceeded to recover the amounts. Mr. Shannon, however, went to Belfast, where service of the summonses having been effected with some difficulty, the cases were eventually heard. The magistrates made an order for the full amounts with costs. They refused to enter into the merits and, as it has been judicially decided that their functions in such cases are purely magisterial, they appear to have acted correctly in so refusing and merely giving a decree for the amounts of the surcharges. The guardians are prohibited by law from affording outdoor relief to occupiers of over a quarter of an acre of land. They are well aware of the existence of this prohibition, and the auditor had no option but to make the surcharge.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 389.]

A POINT OF ORDER.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) said he desired the ruling of Mr. Speaker on a point of order. Yesterday he put down a Question to the President of the Board of Education for oral Answer. It was clear that it vitally concerned the business before the House to-day. The Question was not reached, having been put down too late. He had neither received an Answer privately nor had one been printed with the Votes. He desired to ask whether there was any redress under the circumstances.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not know what the explanation is. The rule is, in case the Answers to the Questions have not been reached, to hand them in at the Table and they will be circulated with the Votes in the morning. For what reason the ordinary rule was not followed I do not know.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) said if the Question had been reached and had been put orally he had intended to ask the hon. Gentleman to allow him to circulate the Answer with the Votes, as it was a very long one. He had given instructions that the Answer was to be circulated with the Papers that morning, and if it had not been circulated he was extremely sorry.

MR. JAMES HOPE said he was satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman.

EDUCATION BILL.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I beg to give notice that on Monday I shall move, "That the Order for the Committee Stage of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill be discharged and the Bill withdrawn."

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended, read.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee) moved to recommit the Bill to a Committee of the Whole House, in respect of the new clause standing on the Notice Paper on 12th November last. Owing to the noise in the House the greater part of the right hon. Gentleman's observations were not heard in the Gallery. He was understood to say: When this Bill was in Committee, the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone pressed me very strongly, the hour being late, not to proceed with the new clause which stood in my name on the Paper, and urged that facilities should be granted for the discussion of the clause relating to the acquisition of land by the authority of the Port of London. The Motion which I now make is part of the bargain which was arrived at late at night, and which was that in consequence of the general assistance in the despatch of business which the Committee were good enough to give the Government, I should move to recommit the new clauses, before entering on the consideration of the Bill as amended. I beg to move.

Motion made and Question, "That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of the new clauses standing on the Notice Paper on the 12th day of November last,"—(*Mr. Churchill,*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

MR. CHURCHILL moved a new clause giving power to the Board of Trade to authorise the construction of works, etc. He said: There are unnecessary misapprehensions in the House and outside it as to the scope and character of the new clause which I now move. In the first place, this clause in the form in which I have placed it on the Paper does not constitute the reintroduction of the clause which was mutilated by the Committee. The amended form modifies and very extensively restricts and reduces the character of the clause, which has been adopted with a view, so far as possible, to meeting the principal objections which led to its mutilation before the Committee upstairs. The clause, as originally conceived by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed to give the new Port authority special facilities in regard to the acquisition of land and certain other works of construction which they might be called upon to undertake. There was the clause and there was the schedule. The facilities were of two kinds. By the clause an easier, a more expeditious and more convenient procedure was substituted for the regular procedure provided by the Bill. In the schedule the conditions on which land could be acquired were assimilated to the conditions under which it may be now acquired in connection with the working of the Small Holdings Act. Now that was the clause as it was put before the Committee. As it is now the schedule is no longer in the Bill, and consequently we have not to deal with any proposal for modifying the usual practice for acquiring land under the Lands Clauses Acts. The procedure is perfectly known and will be rigidly followed in any acquisition of land under this clause. We are only concerned with the question whether we shall or shall not allow the Port authority to adopt some simpler means of procedure so far as Parliament is concerned than that which is generally followed. I do submit most earnestly to the House that there is a very strong case for not denying to the new Port Authority something like the same facilities as those accorded to and enjoyed by the great competing ports on the Continent—Antwerp, Hamburg, and other ports which are rivals to the Port of London. There are grave disadvantages about forcing an authority of this character to come to Parliament for powers in connection with every small piece of land, however insignificant, which it may wish to acquire, and to go through all the expense and all the friction involved in the controverted passage of a private Bill. The result of such a procedure would, I think, be that, instead of extending its wharfage, the Port Authority would endeavour to get along as far as it could without acquiring land. I submit that those who think that the Port Authority ought to have a fair chance consider that it is very desirable to give them a certain measure of confidence and elbow-room in respect to the acquisition of land. I feel, on the other hand, that where the transaction is on a large scale it is necessary and proper that Parliament should survey it. It has been proposed that power should be given to the Board of Trade to dispense with the need of access to Parliament where the transaction is small and uncontroversial. The anxiety which has been aroused, I think, quite unnecessarily, by the clause as it stands with the Schedule in its original form, still continues, though to a less extent, in regard to the clause as it is modified, and I have, therefore, endeavoured, so far as I can, to ascertain the views of Members on both sides of the House and of the Standing Committee. As a result of several conferences which have been held, I have been able to meet the general view of members of the Committee and of the House. Their point has been that, while it is desirable that the Port Authority shall have liberty as to the acquisition of land, they do not think the Board of Trade should be constituted the sole judge as to whether Parliamentary powers should be dispensed with. They think there is too much Board of Trade in the Bill, and that the Government are giving too great a discretionary power into the hands of a Department. I will, therefore, be prepared to move to subsection (3) an Amendment providing that, before making an order authorising the acquisition of land, the Board of Trade under this section shall appoint an impartial person to hold a public inquiry on their behalf. The effect of that would be that the Board of Trade may delegate their power to some impartial person, who would hold a public inquiry and decide whether the case is one which ought to come before Parliament or whether it is small enough to be settled by him. It would, however, still be in the power of the Board of Trade to say that the matter should come before Parliament in the ordinary course. I also propose to move an Amendment saving from the operation of the clause any existing statutory right in regard to land.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) Is the inquiry by the Board of Trade to be by only one person or are several persons to be appointed?

MR. CHURCHILL: Only one person is to be appointed. Let me assure the hon. Gentleman opposite. The idea is that very small matters may arise which would certainly not be of sufficient importance to be dealt with on the merits by the elaborate procedure of private Bills, and in that case the Board of Trade will appoint an impartial person to hold a public inquiry. I trust that the modifications and safeguards which have now been made will remove the apprehensions which have been felt and the prejudice which has existed against this clause. Let me once again remind the Committee how important these alterations are. First of all, the Schedule is gone. There is no new procedure as to the terms on which land shall be acquired; there is only a simplification of the procedure. In the second place, by Section 3 the operation is confined to small transactions. In the third place, an impartial person is to be appointed, not a departmental official, but one outside the scope and authority of the Department, and who will decide whether or not the transaction is small enough to be decided by him or whether it should come to Parliament.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said there was no allusion in subsection (3) to small transactions.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think I am right when I say small transactions—

> "If it appears to the Board of Trade that by reason of the extent or situation of any land proposed to be acquired compulsorily, or the purposes for which such land is used, or any other circumstances, the land ought not to be acquired compulsorily without the sanction of Parliament, the order of the Board shall be provisional only and shall not have effect unless confirmed by Parliament."

I am advised that this would confine the operation of this dispensing power to small transactions, and an impartial person would be able to make sure that a free, thorough, and dispassionate interpretation is placed upon what are or are not small transactions. With those safeguards I think the House ought to entrust the Port Authority with the powers we seek to confer upon it. It would be a great hindrance if this great Port of London had to fight for its prosperity and its existence against rivals equipped with far greater powers as to the acquisition of land and the construction of works than are possessed in this country at the present time. It would be unduly hampering the new Port authority in the struggle they will have to carry on against great and powerful Continental competitors, if they were denied by the House the very carefully safeguarded liberties which I now venture respectfully to demand on their behalf. I beg to move.

New clause—

"(1) Where the Port Authority propose to construct, equip, maintain, or manage any works, and the works proposed to be constructed are such that they cannot be constructed without statutory authority, or are such that in the opinion of the Board of Trade they ought not to be constructed except under the authority of such an order as is hereinafter mentioned, or compulsory powers are required for the acquisition of land, or it is sought to impose any charges not previously authorised in respect of the use of any works when constructed, the Port Authority may apply to the Board of Trade, and thereupon the Board of Trade may make an order:—(*a*) Authorising the construction and equipment of such docks, quays, wharves, jetties, or piers, and buildings, railways, and other works in connection therewith as may be specified in the order; (*b*) authorising the purchase and taking otherwise than by agreement of such land as may be specified in the order; (*c*) authorising the imposition, levying, collection, and recovery of such dues, rates, tolls, and other charges in respect of the use of any works proposed to be constructed, and conferring such powers of management of those works, as may be specified in the order; (*d*) authorising the Port Authority to charge to capital, as part of the cost of construction of any work authorised by the order, the interest on any money raised to defray the expenses of construction of any such work and the acquisition of land for the purpose, for such period and subject to such restrictions as may be mentioned in the order. Provided that:—(*a*) no land shall be authorised by an order under this section to be acquired compulsorily which is situate to the westward of the meridian six minutes east of Greenwich; and (*b*) an order authorising the construction of new works shall impose on the Port Authority an obligation to provide such housing accommodation for the persons to be employed at the new works when constructed as the Board of Trade may from time to time consider requisite. (2) Any order made under this section authorising the purchase and taking of land otherwise than by agreement shall incorporate the Lands Clauses Acts as if the order were a special Act within the meaning of those Acts. Provided that the Board of Trade may by Provisional Order make such modifications and adaptations of the provisions of the Lands Clauses Acts to be incorporated in an order under this section as may be specified in the Provisional Order. (3) If it appears to the Board of Trade that by reason of the extent or situation of any land proposed to be acquired compulsorily, or the purposes for which such land is used, or any other circumstances, the land ought not to be acquired compulsorily without the sanction of Parliament, the order of the Board shall be provisional only and shall not have effect unless confirmed by Parliament."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

LORD R. CECIL said he must tender his very sincere thanks to the right hon. Gentleman for the complete way in which he had fulfilled the pledge which he had given on the last occasion when the Bill was before the House. He had carried out his pledge not only to the letter but in the spirit, and they had a fair opportunity of considering this clause in the fullest possible way. He must confess, however, that his doubts had not been removed by what the right hon. Gentleman had said. The argument put forward for this clause was that it was required in order to enable the Port of London to compete with Continental ports. That must mean that this was to be a really considerable power to be exercised in important matters. It was to be observed that other ports such as Liverpool, for instance, had been quite successful in competing with Continental ports, and so up to now had the Port of London, without these exceptional powers. He had had an opportunity of looking at the evidence given before the Committee, but he confessed that he had not been able to refresh his memory with regard to it for the purposes of to-day, because he was not aware until early that morning that there was any prospect of this Bill coming before the House. But when he did read the evidence he did not perceive any testimony at all that this power was required in order to enable the Port of London to compete against Continental ports, nor did he remember anything of that kind. Possibly he might be mistaken about that, but he was not aware of anything. Therefore he might say that they expected some very clear evidence before the House should be asked to consent to this very large departure from their usual practice in dealing with matters of this kind. He would remind the Committee that this clause as it stood was of a far-reaching character. It proposed to give power to the Board of Trade to—

> "Authorise the construction and equipment of such docks, quays, wharves, jetties, or piers, and buildings, railways, and other works in connection therewith as may be specified in the order."

In other words, as drafted, it gave the Board of Trade power to pass any such measure as had ever been brought before Parliament dealing with the construction of docks on the Thames or elsewhere. In subsection (*b*) it went on—

> "Authorising the purchase and taking otherwise than by agreement of such land as may be specified in the order."

The land was some of the most valuable in the country. Far below the line fixed by the Bill there was land of enormous industrial value, and the proposal was that it should be acquired without the consent of the parties by order of the Board of Trade. That was to be taken in connection with the enormous works clause in subsection (*a*), and he was not surprised, therefore, to find that the clause was opposed before the Committee, not only by the landowners, but by the Chamber of Commerce and the London County Council, and perhaps by others. Whatever reasons members of the Joint Committee might give for their decision now, they could only speak for themselves—they could not speak for the Committee as a whole, which had rejected the proposal, and he thought the House ought to be exceedingly careful before they reversed, even at the request of the Government, the decision of a strong Joint Committee of that kind on a question which was essentially a matter for evidence and argument. But, apart from that, he had the strongest possible objection to this departure from ordinary procedure. The substance of the proposal was that with reference to this particular undertaking a special law was to be made which did not apply to any other similar undertaking in the country, and the nature of that special legislation was to be to oust the jurisdiction of Parliament to a perfectly indefinite extent. The right hon. Gentleman said it was only intended to be used for small transactions, but really the security that the House had that it would be only so used was of the flimsiest possible description. There was nothing whatever in subsection (3) which limited it to small transactions. All it said was that the Board of Trade after an inquiry before an impartial person, who might, for aught he knew, be one of the officers of the Board of Trade, might authorise anything which was within the terms of this clause. He did not understand why the right hon. Gentleman said that was necessarily to be confined to small transactions. If he had put into the clause a statement that no transaction involving a capital expenditure of more than £1,000, or something of that kind, should be sanctioned under the order of the Board of Trade, there would be a real security; though he should still dislike the clause, it would be some ground for believing there would be an important limitation of the power of the Board of Trade. Otherwise, what it came to was this, that the House was asked to authorise the supersession of Parliament in reference to this particular matter. He regarded it as a very serious request from the point of view of the private interests involved in the territory below the line fixed by the Bill. It was a very serious thing to say to people who had built their works on the faith that they were going to be submitted to the ordinary risks of the law, and who knew that their property could not be taken from them compulsorily, apart from these provisions, without an inquiry before an impartial Committee of the House, and, if necessary, the other House: "The whole of that security on which you have built your works and laid out your money is to be taken away and you are to be remitted to the decision of any officer of the Board of Trade, not only at the present time but in future." That was a very serious thing from the point of view of private interests and a very important change to make in the position of those who had invested large sums of money in the land affected. But, apart from that, it was utterly wrong from the point of view of the Department. Here was a great undertaking, the greatest of its kind he supposed in the country. It had been set up under conditions which many people in that House—he did not share the view himself—regarded as of a very experimental character and by no means certain to be a success as the Bill was at present drafted. Surely it was more important than in any other case that Parliament should have control and supervision over the proceedings of a body of that kind. They ought to know and to have an opportunity of considering any great expenditure, any considerable change which the body proposed to be set up should authorise in future. He certainly thought if anybody was to be treated in an exceptional way it was not certainly a body of this kind, of enormous wealth and resources, and of a very experimental character. There was no reason in the world that could be given why the Port of London should have this exceptional privilege which would not be far more applicable to the smallest undertaking in the country, and yet nobody he supposed would suggest that it should be given to any private or semi-public company which came to ask for powers of this description. A great deal was made before the Committee of the light railway precedent. It was said that after all what was being done in this Bill was only copying what was done by the Light Railway Act of 1896. He was very glad the right hon. Gentleman had not repeated that argument, because it was really utterly worthless and wholly misleading. The Light Railway Act was a wholly different proposal, passed in order to assist poor agricultural districts where expenditure was necessarily likely to be of a very small character, and far greater safeguards were put into that Act than were proposed in this clause. There was to be an inquiry before what was substantially equal to, at any rate, a Committee of that House. A very strong Commission was constituted, with Lord Jersey at the head and an engineer and a lawyer to assist him, and every proposal for a light railway had to go before it and be sanctioned and confirmed by the Board of Trade. There were also far greater precautions with reference to notice than were proposed here. If they put aside this precedent the proposal was absolutely unprecedented. No single instance had come before Parliament of a proposal to give to a great body a special power such as this, and if it was done at all it should not be done in the case of a body of great resources and strength, which was exactly the body to be least injured by being forced to come to Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken as if an undertaking of this kind might be hampered because it could not buy a small piece of land or make some trifling alteration in its works without a Provisional Order. But such a great undertaking would perpetually have great changes, the very things which the right hon. Gentleman thought ought not to be done by Board of Trade order. The practice was to keep these small things back for a year or do them without Parliamentary authority. They were then all put into a Bill and confirmed in one Provisional Order which was passed every other year and the whole thing was disposed of without any additional expense. He very seriously pressed the Government not to persist in this proposal. It was a serious precedent which would arouse a great deal of opposition to the Bill.

Sir EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N. E.) said he did not follow the statement that this was exactly the body which ought to be compelled to come to Parliament whenever it required power to purchase land. It seemed to him it was exactly the body that ought not to have that burden placed upon it. The noble Lord would consider it a calamity that the Metropolitan boroughs exercised compulsory powers of taking land. It did not seem to be altogether a new principle.

Lord R. CECIL said it was very carefully limited to widening existing streets. It was necessarily of a very small character.

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL said that bore out his point. It was very wisely limited to the powers and duties of the authorities, and this clause was limited to the powers and duties of the authority. It seemed to be an exactly similar case. This was a most valuable clause to the new Port Authority. So far as one could judge, the House, irrespective of party, was agreed that this new Port Authority ought to be set up and London ought to be given the chance to bring the trade of the Port up to a higher level. He did not suppose anyone would suggest that the new authority was likely to be a predatory body, and to try to take land regardless of those who had invested in it, or that, with the protection of the Board of Trade, anything was likely to happen under the clause other than what would be advantageous to the new Port Authority. It was not child's play. It was not going to be an easy business for the new authority to come in and take over the whole of the docks of London, the duties of the Thames Conservancy, and the whole responsibility of the heavy debt which would be placed upon them to work out the salvation of the Port of London. Directly the new Port Authority found it wanted a piece of land for any purpose it would have to come to Parliament. The noble Lord opposite said that that was a good thing, and that Parliament ought to control this new authority. Personally he did not think Parliament ought to do anything of the kind. Why should a small body of men in the carrying out of their duties always be coming to Parliament? He had had a long experience on the London County Council and the Thames Conservancy Board, and he knew what coming to Parliament meant. It meant that the officers of the Port Authority, instead of going on with their work and devoting their whole time and energies to the service of the new authority, would have their time taken up obtaining permission from Parliament upon such matters as obtaining a piece of land for a dock. The officers of the new authority ought to be able to devote all their time and energy to the real business of the Port of London. If some very large undertaking had to be entered into it might be worth the while of the Port Authority to spend a great deal of time getting the permission of Parliament. The new authority would be placed more under the control of a Government Department than any other similar authority, and it would be a fatal mistake to press opposition to this clause. He hoped the House would decide to give the new authority a fair and good chance of carrying out successfully the duties entrusted to it by Parliament.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said he would like to ask the President of the Board of Trade what point was represented geographically on the River Thames by subsection (*a*).

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to say that it would exempt all land west of Barking Creek.

SIR GILBERT PARKER admitted that the clause had much to be said for it, because it certainly relieved them of some very strong objections which they had hitherto felt regarding the supreme authority and plenary powers given to the Port Authority. He was not speaking in any spirit of antagonism to the Bill, and he would be quite satisfied if what the President of the Board of Trade intended was carried out. He understood that private owners were going to be protected, but he wished to point out that there were some competitive private owners who would be in competition with the Port Authority itself. The Board of Trade in subsection (2) took precautions to prevent the Port Authority from abusing, however innocently, their great plenary powers by taking from private owners land and property which might be in competition with the very interests which the Port Authority represented. He hoped the President of the Board of Trade appreciated his point. He would take, for example, the P. & O. Company. That company owned a considerable amount of land which he believed they intended to make use of by erecting buildings upon it. The P. & O. Company were very much unsettled by the power to be given under this Bill to the Port Authority to acquire land compulsorily. The President of the Board of Trade said they were providing that in the acquisition of any very large piece of land or any very important piece of property the Board of Trade might decide whether it should be compulsorily acquired, or whether the new authority should come to Parliament in order to secure the right to acquire that property. He understood that it was only small pieces of property and small interests which would be dealt with independently of Parliament. He did not think the subsection was quite clear, and he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer who, from the beginning had been most reasonable, would see that the very thing that the right hon. Gentleman was always so strong about when he was sitting in Opposition—that Parliament should always be supreme, that the voice of the people should be heard, and that all interests should be safeguarded by an appeal to Parliament—was being disregarded, and that they were placing the whole responsibility upon the Board of Trade itself or upon its appointee. The Board of Trade said they were going to have an impartial person, and he supposed that the word "person" under an Act of Parliament might mean several persons.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): It includes persons.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said there still remained absolutely in the hands of the Department the power to decide whether any application by the Port Authority to acquire property was large enough to warrant a reference to Parliament. Whatever confidence he might have in the permanent officials of the Board of Trade or the representative of the Unionist Party or of the Liberal Party at the head of that Department, he was opposed to giving power to any public Department to deal arbitrarily with any expenditure of money or the acquisition of property without Parliamentary control, because that was bureaucratic. This was a bureaucratic clause, and it was throwing more and more upon the administration of the Port Authority. The noble Lord the Member for Marylebone made a suggestion which he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would accept, and that was that some limit should be put upon the value of the purchase which the Board of Trade might authorise. Suppose they limited the property to be acquired with the consent of the Board of Trade to £100,000 and provided that anything to a greater value than that should not be acquired compulsorily without reference to Parliament. It might be found necessary to place the limit at £200,000, but he thought there ought to be a safeguard of some kind inserted in the clause. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman would find after the discussion they had had upon this point that the view which his noble friend had presented would have a response outside the House much more pronounced than the Government had any idea of. There were many interests involved, and the Government ought not to lose sight of the fact that the Port Authority would be a rival in the exploitation of river interests and acquiring property with private organisations, and the suspicion which existed among private organisations and river companies owning wharves and jetties was very great. That suspicion would not be allayed by this clause, excellent as it was in intention, because it did not go far enough or satisfy those who raised objection to the plenary powers which were being given to the Port Authority without reference to Parliament.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There will be an independent inquiry.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he was very doubtful about an independent inquiry unless it meant something more than sending down an official of the Board of Trade. Did it mean that?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the President of the Board of Trade had already made it clear that it did not mean simply an inquiry by an official of the Board of Trade.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he apologised to the President of the Board of Trade if he had misrepresented him. He understood they were going to send down an impartial person or persons to make the inquiry, and he did not think that promise was quite sufficient. The person appointed to inquire might be a colonel, or some one who might or might not know much about finance. While this Bill pretended to be a solution of a good many things it was not quite clear enough in its definitions. He appealed to the President of the Board of Trade to consider what the effect would be in the country, and especially on the commercial and industrial population on the river. The right hon. Gentleman had shown from the beginning that he did not wish to be in any way tyrannical in dealing with the river interests. He was anxious as President of the Board of Trade that the Port Authority should not have power which was too arbitrary. He himself believed still that the power proposed to be given under subsection (3) was too arbitrary, and if that was not so with respect to the Port Authority itself, the arbitrary power still remained with the Board of Trade. If the Unionist Party were in office, the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues would not trust them. [Cries of "Oh."] They did not trust them in connection with the administrative departments with full and unlimited confidence. The right hon. Gentleman himself would be the first to say that he did not think the Board of Trade ought to have this discretionary authority, and that there should be some limitation to its discretion. The power to purchase should be clearly restricted to an amount beyond which it should not be able to go without applying to Parliament. He urged the right hon. Gentleman to agree to insert some words in the subsection which would restrict the amount which the Board of Trade would have the option, as it were, of authorising in regard to the purchase of any given property without an application to Parliament. It might be £100,000, £200,000, or £300,000, but some amount should be stated so that the country would know the limit beyond which the Port Authority and the Board of Trade could not go without the sanction of Parliament. He begged the right hon. Gentleman to give that point his careful consideration.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) asked whether it was intended to give effect to the promise made on behalf of the Board of Trade at an earlier stage of the Bill that corporations which had acquired lands under Act of Parliament, and which might not be particularly using those lands, should be exempt from what might be called the administrative order procedure created by this Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought it was desirable that a statement should be made on that point. His right hon. friend had prepared an Amendment on this subject, and it was now in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman on the other side. It was of a very drastic character and covered all undertakings of that kind. It was proposed by that Amendment to exclude from the operation of the clause lands which had been acquired under Act of Parliament for the purpose of railways or other undertakings. He quite saw the force of the contention of those who maintained that a mere order made by the Board of Trade should not over-ride an Act of Parliament, and for that reason they proposed to exclude all lands of that kind.

MR. RUSSELL REA (Gloucester) said the noble Lord opposite had expressed regret that he had not had an opportunity of refreshing his memory in regard to the proceedings before the Joint Committee. He should like to refresh his memory. This was not the clause which was rejected by the Joint Committee; it was with a little modification the clause which was accepted by them. It was a surprise to himself that the Board of Trade dropped the clause, and then, thinking better of it, reinserted it. The Committee altered the clause by depriving the Board of Trade of the power to make a Departmental Order. The Committee accepted the provision that land might be taken by Provisional Order.

LORD R. CECIL: My objection is to ousting Parliament altogether. I have no real objection to proceeding by Provisional Order.

MR. RUSSELL REA said the bureaucratic method was rejected by the Joint Committee. The Provisional Order provided for under this clause was not to extend to all purchases. It had excluded very small properties. He could not say that the Committee approved of that, but he himself did approve of the qualification. He could not conceive that any purchase, such as the hon. Member for Gravesend mentioned, of a property to the value of £200,000 or £300,000 could ever be sanctioned by the order of an administrative board. It would, of course, come under the purview of the House in the form of a Provisional Order. The clause as it now stood gave greater advantages to landowners and third parties than when it was passed by the Joint Committee. He thought the introduction of an independent arbitrator gave perfect security to third parties who might be interested. He could conceive of only one class of persons who might suffer in the least, and that was those who were interested in the costly and cumbrous procedure of Private Bill legislation. Individually, he should prefer this revised clause to the original clause as it was altered by the Joint Committee in Westminster Hall.

*Mr. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) said that in discussing this clause the Committee appeared to be losing sight of the most important fact that the new Port Authority would at once come into possession of much vacant land now the property of the Dock Companies. Future purchases would thus be within very narrow limits. As to Tilbury Dock and the Albert Dock, it was evident that the possibility was most remote that the Port Authority would require any extension of land there, but they might require to get hold of some fringes of land adjoining them. Therefore, this clause was likely to be of considerable service to them. At the same time he did not think there could be any risk to the general public. He spoke feelingly because he happened to be a member of a firm of manufacturers with works on the river side, and if the clause were applied to any great extent, it would not be for the public benefit. He thought the House was viewing this clause with too much concern. They should allow it to pass, and get to the other parts of the Bill.

Mr. W. GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds) desired to express the very strong objection which the London County Council felt against this clause as it had been put down by the President of the Board of Trade. He quite recognised that it was rather less drastic in its present form than when it was considered by the Joint Committee; but still it had not been modified sufficiently to abate the considerable amount of alarm felt by the London County Council. They had been told by the hon. Member for Bethnal Green, who had knowledge of these matters, that it was undesirable that the Port Authority should have to ask for Parliamentary powers to acquire small pieces of land, and that some clause of the kind was necessary. He agreed, but he thought that it would be best if the clause were put back to the form approved by the Joint Committee; that was to say to re-insert that a Provisional Order was necessary, and not merely an Order of the Board of Trade. The proposal of the President of the Board of Trade to limit what might be spent in buying land did not, he thought, necessarily meet the danger; because it might be quite possible for the Port Authority to buy a large quantity of small properties and by that method get beyond the statutory limit.

The CHAIRMAN said it seemed to him that hon. Members were talking about Amendments to the clause. Would it not be better to read the clause a second time, and after that had been disposed of, the points of detail could be raised.

Mr. WALTER GUINNESS said it was rather difficult to know in what way they were to vote, unless they got the opinion of the Government as to the different suggestions which had been made to meet the difficulty. Two had already been referred to; he had a third, which was to proceed by Provisional Order.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the various suggestions made by hon. Members were down on the Paper in the form of Amendments to the clause, one in the name of the hon. Member who had just spoken. He submitted that it was desirable to proceed with these Amendments after the formal Second Reading had been given to the clause.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said he objected to the principle of this clause, on the ground that it gave, for no sufficient reason which had yet been shown, unprecedented and almost unlimited powers to the Board of Trade. The hon. Member for Bethnal Green had said that it would be a most disadvantageous thing if the new Port Authority had to come to Parliament every time it wished to carry out some particular work, and his view was that there should be no restriction on the Board of Trade's giving the authority to do so. For his part he entirely objected to any authority, public or private, being able to deal with private interests, or indeed with public interests, without coming either directly or indirectly to Parliament for authority to do so. The President of the Board of Trade had said that the boundary had been fixed so as to exclude the great bulk of the building land around the Port from the operation of the clause. He had examined the map and marked off the boundary—the meridian six minutes East of Greenwich—and found that so far from the great bulk of the building land being excluded it was included within the operation of this clause. Moreover, the clause did not merely deal with the acquisition of land on the river side for docks, quays, wharves, jetties, piers, and buildings, but railways and other works in connection therewith. In other words, land might be taken compulsorily without Parliament being consulted, not merely for buildings and riverside works, but for railways which might involve the acquisition of any amount of land not directly on the river. He hoped he was not unreasonable in his attitude in regard to the matter. He thought the Bill was on the whole a most admirable one, and he earnestly desired to see it pass; but there was no sufficient reason for departing from the recognised practice which required the authority of Parliament for compulsory acquisition of property. The Bill conferred enormous, and, as he held, mischievous powers on a Government Department; and, as had been said by one hon. Member, there was too much Board of Trade in the Bill. The President of the Board of Trade had said that the Board would appoint an impartial person to hold an inquiry, but everybody knew that any Government Department was not unwilling to increase the powers given to it by this House, and he thought it was not a proper system that the decision of a question involving the position taken by the Board of Trade should be given to anyone appointed by the Board of Trade itself. He maintained that if any matter was to be inquired into it should be done not by a person appointed by the Board of Trade but by a person appointed in the ordinary way by the parties to the transaction. It was all very well for the right hon. Gentleman to say that large transactions would never be sanctioned under this clause. Why not? What guarantee was there that they would not be? The only security against that would be the decision of the Department itself. There was no reason why the House should abrogate its functions in favour of the Board of Trade, and for this wholly exceptional procedure being applied to a Government Department. His objection might be met if the powers to be given to the Board of Trade were confined to small matters.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he trusted that the Committee would now come to a decision on the Second Reading of the clause, and then proceed to the examination of the details when the Amendments on the Paper were moved. Every hon. Member who had spoken, including the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, had accepted the principle of the clause. The noble Lord had admitted that it was desirable that there should be a cheap method of acquiring land, although his method was different from that of the Government. What was the object of the clause? It was to render it unnecessary for the Port Authority to come to Parliament whenever they wanted a few acres of land for the purpose of increasing the facilities of the Port. Coming to Parliament in order to obtain a private Bill meant enormous expense. It meant that every time general questions could be raised. The noble Lord knew that if a railway company came to Parliament for a few acres of land for the purpose of a railway siding or an extension, the whole question of the rates would be raised.

Lord R. CECIL said that that was done in Committee and not in the House.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE agreed; but why should the Port Authority every time it wanted a few acres of land to increase the accommodation of the Port have to come to Parliament for powers? The noble Lord said, "Look at Liverpool and other ports in the Kingdom; everybody knew from experience what they did. They saved up these little things, and did not bring in a Bill every time they wanted to acquire a few acres of land; they waited until a sufficient number of such requirements had accumulated to justify the trouble and expense entailed by coming to Parliament and promoting a private Bill to obtain the necessary powers. But that was not once a year, or every two years, or three years." How often did the noble Lord imagine that the Port of Liverpool had been coming to Parliament with these Bills? Not very often; he remembered one Bill. What did the noble Lord suggest? He suggested that when the Port Authority wanted a few acres of land for an extension, they were to wait for years until there was an accumulation of these needs before they came to Parliament. Really that was not necessary. Here was a great Port, the greatest Port in the world, which must suffer inconvenience, at all events, to that extent, because they would not have the power to acquire the land when they wanted it unless they came to Parliament. Why should they not get it when they wanted it, instead of having to wait, as they would have to do, perhaps for a long time, if the view of the noble Lord was adopted? Besides, the expense of going before a Parliamentary Committee was enormous, as it rendered necessary payment of very expensive counsel and expert witnesses. He made no imputation on the noble Lord when he said he took the traditional view of the Parliamentary barrister as to the desirability of bringing everything upstairs. That, however, meant the piling on of expense, and anybody who wished to inconvenience the Port Authority, or, still worse, anyone who wanted a big price out of them, would be glad of this procedure. Very often these proceedings upstairs were blackmailing proceedings, and were fought simply in order to get a big price from the company promoting a Bill. People objected very often because they knew they would get a very big price from the company in order to get them out of the way. This was done deliberately, and Parliament ought not to be a sort of huge blackmailing machine for the purpose of extracting extravagant prices out of great commercial and industrial enterprises. High railway rates were now being paid, largely as a result of the railway companies being compelled to come to Parliament every time they needed power to build a station for the convenience of the public, or to form a crossing, or to widen their line. There should be some cheap method by which they could secure authority on paying fair value in respect of the property affected. Why should they adopt the present method which involved very great expenditure in regard to compulsory purchase? He maintained that it was the business of Parliament to help this Port Authority to acquire the land which they might need as cheaply and expeditiously as possible, in order to enable it to do its work. The noble Lord quoted the precedent of the Light Railways Act under which people did not have to come to Parliament every time they wanted land for a light railway. The noble Lord said that simply because Lord Jersey happened to be on the Light Railways Commission, it was not a question of principle with him, but merely of a particular person who administered the particular Act.

An HON. MEMBER: Lord Jersey is not on the Commission now.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was not saying a word disparaging of Lord Jersey, who was a very admirable, worthy, and judicial man, but surely there were plenty of men in this country who were able to administer an Act of this kind judicially, ably, and with the utmost impartiality. A Government Department would direct an inquiry in the circumstances mentioned in the clause, but as everybody knew perfectly well, would not interfere with a judicial investigation of that sort, or overrule such an inquiry.

LORD R. CECIL said that similar inquiries had been over-ruled more than once.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said Government Departments would never interfere in such an inquiry, and if it over-ruled the result it would only be in the very interests which the noble Lord wished to press upon Parliament and the Committee. Supposing the Commissioner decided that it was a case for Parliamentary inquiry, the noble Lord surely did not imagine that the Board of Trade would overrule that. They could not face Parliament under such circumstances. His right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade, who was very well acquainted with the clause as drafted, assured him that the Department could not over-rule the decision of a Commissioner, after a judicial inquiry, that a particular case was one which should come before Parliament, in the sense of making an order in spite of his decision. If there was any doubt about that his right hon. friend wished to make the point clear, and, if necessary, would insert an Amendment to do so. If the Commissioner reported in favour of an order being made the Board of Trade might over-rule that, but surely the noble Lord would not complain of that. Really the Government were not proposing anything nearly so strong as the Light Railways Act, which was proposed by a Conservative Government, and which gave certain powers to Commissioners, with an appeal to the Board of Trade.

LORD R. CECIL said the right hon. Gentleman was inaccurate. He did not want to go into the details of the Light Railways procedure, but as a matter of fact if the Light Railways Commission rejected an application his impression was that there was no recourse at all. Certainly there was practically none.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said if the noble Lord said so he would not dispute it as he knew that he had more practical experience than he himself had of the working of that Act. He would take it that they adopted the same procedure here. They did not propose to take power to override the decision of the Commissioners. The power proposed to be given was conferred on every Continental port; he had never heard of a case where it was not.

SIR GILBERT PARKER did not like to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but he thought it would help the Committee if he could elicit some information. There was a particular provision in the clause under which there might or might not be a provisional order. There was to be one if it appeared to the Board of Trade that by reason of the extent or situation of the land proposed to be acquired compulsorily it ought not to be taken without the sanction of Parliament. What he should like to hear was what the right hon. Gentleman considered a large extension and what would be considered a small one.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Board of Trade were proposing to put a very considerable limitation upon the clause, and to restrict the power to operations of a very small character. The hon. Gentleman suggested a limitation of value, but he would tell him at once why a limitation of value would not really assist him on the point whether a particular operation was of importance in its effect upon other interests. He could understand an operation which would be a small one in value being a very considerable one in importance. They might have a very small operation which by its effect upon the navigation of the river might seriously affect other interests either above or below the place where it was made. Therefore, his first objection to the limitation was that it really did not meet the case which had been put by the Opposition. A £50,000 transaction might be regarded as small, but might turn out to involve a most important operation, whereas £500,000 might refer to a very trivial operation as it might have regard to a large tract of waste land, the acquisition of which did not affect anybody, the only question being one of price. It might not affect the navigation of the river or the riverside trader and might belong to somebody who was very glad to get rid of it at a price. A large transaction might therefore be a very small one from the point of view of importance, and a small transaction might be a very serious one. Therefore, he suggested that value was not the best criterion in a matter of this kind. How, moreover, were they to get at the value? They might send someone down to sit in judgment upon it, and he might say he did not think it was worth more than £100,000. He was not an expert, and the value was not fixed by one until after the order of the Board of Trade had been issued. When the valuation under the Lands Clauses Acts came it might be discovered that land which was thought worth only £80,000 was worth £150,000. What was to happen then: were they to go back to another inquiry and begin afresh?

Sir GILBERT PARKER: You may take it into account.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Who may take it into account?

Sir GILBERT PARKER: The Commissioner will take it into account.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: But he does not decide the price. If the whole matter was to be carried through and it was discovered under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Acts that the land was of much more value, that was a very serious thing. It was no use to put in a clause of this kind unless it was going to be operative. To say they were exceedingly anxious to give the authority full powers to buy the land cheaply and expeditiously, and then to hedge it round with all sorts of restrictions and conditions of this kind would be futile. He thought the Board of Trade had gone just as far as they could, and that there was ample protection afforded under the clause. The last subsection was a much better guarantee than the value because, as he had pointed out, there would be pieces of land so situated that they were small in value.

Mr. BOWLES asked whether, supposing Parliament took the view that this was a thing of a large character and that they ought to be consulted and the Board of Trade took the opposite view, would the order be a provisional one. Under this section he submitted not.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE pointed out that hon. Members would have the check upon the Government which they had in every Act of Parliament. That was the only check they ever could have either in this or any other Act. The Board of Trade was as free from prejudice as any department he knew of, and was perfectly impartial. They appointed an expert to examine into this matter and he having considered all the circumstances decided whether the thing should be brought before Parliament or whether an order ought to be made.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) asked whether the last subsection was not governed by the words, "If it appears," which gave only a discretion to the Board of Trade.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE replied that his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade was going to move words which would meet the point raised by the hon. Baronet, and make it perfectly clear that it was not merely discretionary, but that the Board of Trade was compelled by the Act to exclude cases of that character. He appealed to the House to bring this discussion to a conclusion and get to the details of the clause, as everyone agreed that it was desirable to acquire cheap land.

Mr. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne), speaking in the interests of those engaged in river and wharf traffic, which represented nearly half the shipping trade of the Port, said they viewed with the greatest apprehension the object of this clause, which was, clearly, to leave to the Board of Trade the decision of very important matters affecting the interest of the whole of the traders of London. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade had endeavoured to prove that the clause was intended to deal only with small matters. He ventured to point out, with all deference to these right hon. Gentlemen, that it meant something more than the purchase of an acre of land for a jetty. The clause provided for the building and construction of jetties and docks, and, in view of the increased size of ships, any dock which the Port Authority might build hereafter would not be built on a few acres of land, but would require many acres of land. It would, obviously, be a large matter, and, in such a matter, the Authority ought to be compelled to come to Parliament. The President of the Board of Trade had said the object of this clause was to enable the Authority to create a Port which should be able to compete with the great Continental ports. The new Authority would, no doubt, regard a great scheme with a light heart, but they must remember that that scheme would have to be paid for. He sincerely hoped the President of the Board of Trade would give them some guarantee that, if the scheme exceeded a certain sum of money, the Authority must obtain Parliamentary sanction to spend that sum. If they had a guarantee that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to return to the Board of Trade or that the President of the Board of Trade was going to remain there, then they would have confidence in them, but from past experience the commercial community had not that confidence in the Department which right hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to think, and as in the near future there might be a change at the Board of Trade, he sincerely hoped they would grant the request made to them and make some limit at any rate beyond which that new Authority should not go without the consent of Parliament

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford) supported the request which had been made by hon. Members opposite, that some limit should be put in the clause. He had listened to the whole of the debate, and he felt that the objections that had been raised to this new clause had not been met. All those who supported the clause seemed to look upon these matters as most trifling matters. He, on the contrary, was of opinion that the undertakings under the clause would be of great magnitude. The clause would give power to go to new places where the authority had no docks whatever. If they intended to undertake anything in the area specifically marked out below Barking Creek they would have to make new docks and new gates and loading wharfs, and things of that sort. Under those circumstances there ought to be some assurance from the President of the Board of Trade that the expenditure which might be incurred outside the control of Parliament would be limited. All those traders who were outside the London area and who were already paying double rates for their goods looked with great fear on the new Authority having these uncontrolled powers.

SIR GILBERT PARKER pointed out that the explanations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the result of the inquiry were not quite clear. He wished to ask whether the Board of Trade would feel themselves bound by the decision of the Commissioner, either for or against a scheme. If the Commissioner said it was a small scheme and need not go before Parliament, or if he said it was one which ought to be sanctioned by Parliament, would they accept his decision without question? In other words would he be an expert the opinion of whom the Board of Trade would be bound to accept?

MR. CHURCHILL: I think I can reassure the hon. Gentleman. There is great difficulty in fixing a numerical financial limit. I do not say the difficulty is absolutely insuperable, but I do believe that it would be a disadvantage and would work inconveniently to insist on a precise and exact limit. One must assume a degree of common-sense and integrity among the parties engaged in carrying out judicial or semi-judicial functions. In the first place, the question of the dispensing power, as I will call it, has to be decided by an impartial person. If that person decides that it is not a case for the exercise of the dispensing power but that it must come by the regular method to Parliament, the Board of Trade would, under the Amendment I propose to move, have no power to overrule that decision. If, on the other hand, the impartial person decides that, in the circumstances, it is a proper case to be dealt with by the dispensing power, the

Board of Trade may, as a result of pressure in this House or of Parliamentary attention being directed to the matter, or of a reconsideration of the whole subject, over-rule the decision of the impartial person and place the whole matter before Parliament.

SIR F. BANBURY said he should like to support his noble friend against the clause. He did not see how it would be possible without a limit——

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a specific Amendment as to the limit, and that matter would better be discussed then.

SIR F. BANBURY said the reason why he wished to vote against the clause was that he conceived it was going to be a distinctly bad precedent. He did not doubt that the new authority would probably do its work well, but they must not forget that a new authority, animated by a desire to make its work successful, might be led away into undertaking big works which, when completed, would be unsuccessful and place a large further expenditure on the Port. There was no question but that in the City of London there was a great fear that the Bill would put a large expense on the people who used the Port, and he did not want to do anything which would in any way tend to increase that expenditure, and he believed that if they passed this clause the result would be to increase the expenditure which so many people in the City feared. If they did not pass the clause the only result would be that the Port Authority would have to come to Parliament. It might cost them something to do that, but the money they would save by bringing their matters before Parliament and allowing the public to discuss them was, in his opinion, likely to outweigh any possible disadvantage arising from the fact that they might have to pay a few fees to counsel and persons of that sort. If Parliament were to abrogate its powers of revision and give them to all these different authorities, they might just as well do away with Parliament altogether. It was no use saying that the new Port Authority was a commercial body and not likely to abuse their powers. It was a question of precedent, and local authorities would desire to have the same powers as the Port Authority. The argument could be advanced that the local authorities were the directly elected representatives of the people and that they could not refuse to give them powers which they had given to a commercial undertaking. He did not want to allude to the Poplar guardians and to a variety of cases such as that which had lately been before the public, but he would just mention that they would do well to keep these powers in their own hands. It was because they desired that Parliament should not part with its authority in a bureaucratic direction that he and his friends opposed this clause. The Chancellor of the Exchequer talked about 5,000 acres. Was it contemplated, then, that 5,000 acres were going to be taken and developed into docks? If so, that opened up a vista which all those interested in these matters would regard with grave concern. Under these circumstances he had no option but to vote against the clause.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) thought they had reason to complain as to the manner in which this matter had been brought on that day, because they were given to understand that it would not come on before next Thursday. He was now told that they were considering an Amendment which was not on the Paper, and he knew nothing of it. Not a hint was given until late the previous night that the Bill was coming on. In regard to this particular clause, the Amendment ought to have been on the Paper. He dared say it was important, but he did not know. He did know, however, that the clause as it stood was an exceedingly wild one, and that it gave power to the Board of Trade and to the Port Authority to speculate with other people's money in any way they chose. He had got to bear in mind this—he might not have much sympathy from the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London—that, in certain circumstances, the Board of Trade might call upon people to pay for all these things by putting a tax on their food. Subsection (*a*) of the new clause would enable the Port Authority to do almost anything they liked, and all the protection the public would have would be, apparently, the Board of Trade. He was sorry to say that the Board of Trade was never much protection, because they only found out things as a rule after they had happened and did not do much to prevent them. He was not making it in any way personal to the present President of the Board, but they must not rely too much on the Board of Trade, because he had found in so many things that they did not find them out in time to be of any use. He remembered some years ago that the House was induced to allow a railway embankment to be placed across the parish of Battersea, and that almost cut the parish in two; that was allowed to be done by the Board of Trade, and the local authorities afterwards had to find money to open it up. It was only the other day he noticed, with regard to an accident on a tube railway, that the Board of Trade had issued a long report in which they said there were a lot of things that ought to have been done to prevent that accident, but they never lifted a finger when those tube railways were being built to get those matters carried out. That was a reason why they should, as far as possible, preserve their liberty and insist, before these wild speculations and schemes were carried out or put in hand, that they should have the opportunity in that House of objecting to them. They should be very careful especially with regard to an authority like the proposed Port of London Authority, which would not be a representative authority like the London County Council, but would be a closed body. The President of the Board of Trade had refused to provide that the meetings should be open to the Press and public, and everything could be carried on secretly. So far as the elected members were concerned they would be elected, not to look after the public, but to look after their own private and perhaps selfish ends. Therefore, there was more than the usual reason why they should take care that people were protected. The only object in having the powers conferred by this clause must be to set up competition with private undertakings, because one of the objects of the authority in buying the docks was to wipe out of existence the private enterprise which, after all, had made the Port of London what it was, and had done very considerable business in an economical way, and had made and kept London the cheapest port in the world, whereas in all probability this Bill would make it the dearest. The main business of the Port of London was to supply food to the millions of inhabitants, and that was all the more reason why the public should be adequately protected.

> "Any order made under this section authorising the purchasing and taking of land otherwise than by agreement shall incorporate the Lands Clauses Acts as if the order were a special Act within the meaning of those Acts."

They had never heard any explanation of that. He was told that there was an Amendment to be moved. The authority was to be authorised to purchase land otherwise than by agreement, so that they would be able to do exactly what they liked with anybody, perhaps for the reason they wished to cover up the deficiency that would be caused by the extraordinary price they proposed to give for the docks.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN pointed out that they were not discussing the Bill as a whole, and the clause now being considered was to enable the authority to construct certain works. On the Second Reading of the clause they could not go into questions of detail which would have to be dealt with by Amendments after the clause had been read a second time.

*MR. MORTON said he desired to obey the ruling of the Chair. He was very sorry that he could not go into the clause as it stood on the Paper. He was only trying to show the danger to the people concerned under the powers to be given by this clause. If he was assured that he could go into details in Committee he would not pursue the matter just now.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: You can go into details on Amendments moved by yourself or others; you cannot go into details on the clause itself.

MR. CHURCHILL: There will be opportunities to address the House on the Report stage.

*Mr. MORTON said it might depend on the Government Whips whether there was any opportunity. He understood that unless Amendments were moved he could not discuss the details. With great respect he was only reading the various subsections and commenting on them as he found them on the Paper.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that on the Second Reading of the clause they only discussed its principle as with the Second Reading of a Bill, and the details of the clause were dealt with in the ordinary way by Amendments, after which the Question would be put "that the clause, or the clause as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Sir F. BANBURY asked whether he was not right when he said that the Second Reading of a clause was conducted in the same way as the Second Reading of a Bill. A Member might give his reasons for moving the rejection of the Bill, and similarly with regard to the Second Reading of a clause. A Member could not go through the clause, line by line, or every word of every line, but he could generally give his reasons for objecting to what was in the clause just as with the Second Reading of a Bill, advancing arguments against the second Reading.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that was just what he had stated.

*Mr. MORTON said he was really trying generally to object to the clause; he was trying to explain his reasons in a general way, and for that reason he had passed over subsection (1) altogether, while he referred to others which he thought were vital so far as the Second Reading was concerned. He might say that he had no Amendments down with regard to the clause, therefore he did not propose to raise discussion by way of Amendment. But he did propose to object to the Second Reading of the clause, because it ought not to be passed in any shape or form unless it was so minimised that it would not be worth anything at all, like clauses that were often inserted in certain Bills. As far as he read the clause, and the powers which it proposed to confer on the Port Authority, practically it was submitted with a view to proving that they were right in purchasing the docks. All the new powers were conferred in order to make the new Port Authority a success, although everybody connected with it, except the shareholders, knew that it would be a failure. Some of the matters contained in the clause would have to be done by Provisional Orders, and he supposed that they would have an opportunity of discussing them. If this new authority was to be allowed to speculate in any way with other people's money and not their own, if they were to sit with closed doors and tax the food of the people in order to find funds, then the very least they should do was to come to Parliament and ask for what they wanted, so that all those who represented the millions to be taxed might have an opportunity of saying why they objected. No explanation, to his knowledge, had ever been given why this clause was introduced at all. If an explanation had been given earlier when he was not present, then his absence was the fault of the Government in misleading him as to what business was to come on that day. In a matter of such vital importance he trusted that the Government would give them some fair consideration, and not rush this through, as apparently they were doing, without proper notice to Members of the House.

Sir GILBERT PARKER said the President of the Board of Trade intended to move an Amendment dealing with the first words of subsection (3), authorising the appointment of a Commissioner. He wanted to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether an opportunity would occur on his Amendment for discussing the question of the authority of the Commissioner, the scope of his inquiry, and the subsequent action which would ensue on that inquiry. This was a very grave question, and they ought not to leave the Second Reading of the clause before they had some assurance on the point whether they would be able to discuss these matters on the Amendment, which they did not possess, and the wording of which they did not know.

MR. CHURCHILL: The hon. Member can certainly discuss these questions. Even if I did not move my Amendment, it would be open to him to move one, or some similar Amendment in regard to the point to which he refers. But I would very respectfully appeal to the Committee to bring this discussion to a close so that we may get to the important Amendments which are on the Paper in the names of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway. I have tried very hard to meet the general convenience of hon. Members, and the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone has frankly and generously recognised that the Government have fulfilled their pledge in a very ample manner. We have now been engaged on this discussion for two hours and a half, and I hope that the Committee will now read the clause a second time and resume that friendly business-like conduct of the Bill which so pleasantly marked its discussion when it was last before the House.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) said the right hon. Gentleman had informed them that if the Commissioner proposed to go on with the inquiry himself it was still open to the Board of Trade to intervene. Would the right hon. Gentleman give them the safeguard that the order of the Commissioner should lie on the Table for thirty days so that it might be dealt with by Parliament in that period? That would give Parliament an opportunity, particularly where there were any works to be dealt with under an order of the Commissioner, to call attention to the scheme. He thought that after the remarks of the hon. Member for Sutherlandshire, and in view of the powers conferred to tax others, they should have the safeguard that the order of the Commissioner should be allowed to lie on the Table for thirty days. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had referred to the difficulty of fixing a limit. But it might not be a question of 5,000 acres. Take this case. Supposing it was sought to divert the channel of the river where there was a sudden bend; they might cut through a piece of land which was not very large, but was a place where wharfingers and others would be interfered with. In such a case the amount of land involved would not be large, yet the consequences would be far-reaching.

Question put and agreed to.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.), who had on the Paper the following Amendment: "To insert after the word 'thereupon,' the words 'after holding an inquiry at which all persons interested shall be heard" said, that after the statement of the right hon. Gentleman he was not sure whether he should move that Amendment or not. They had not got on the Paper the Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman himself was going to move, but if it covered the intention of his own Amendment he would not move it, but if it did not cover it, then he would. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would not mind stating to the House the precise words of his Amendment and what course he intended to take.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 9, after the word 'thereupon,' to insert the words 'after holding an inquiry at which all persons shall be heard.' "—(*Mr. Whitehead.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: My hon. friend has correctly anticipated the effect of the Amendment which I propose to move. That Amendment arranges for the holding of a public inquiry with respect to any acquisition of land. The hon. Member's Amendment proposes that an inquiry shall be held into all matters coming under the operation of the clause. I cannot agree to that, because it appears to me that it would be worse than useless to hamper the Port Authority with a public inquiry whenever they wish in the pursuance of their business even, for example, to put up houses for the accommodation of the labourers who may be working in connection with the London Docks. I think that it would be hampering the whole of the functions of the Port Authority. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman only wishes to have safeguards, and I think that he will see that we are going a long way to meet his views in favour of the obligation of holding a public inquiry in all cases where land is to be acquired.

MR. RENWICK asked whether it was proposed that the tribunal of inquiry should receive evidence from all parties concerned.

MR. CHURCHILL: A public inquiry will be held with all the advantages of publicity attendant upon a public inquiry. Certainly there will be power to take evidence; in fact there is an obligation to take evidence so far as is necessary to arrive at a true decision.

MR. RENWICK said the question was what right or power the parties interested had to give evidence.

MR. WHITEHEAD, after the explanation of the President of the Board of Trade, asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. WALTER GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds) moved an Amendment to insert at the end of line 10, the words "Provisional Order as provided in this section." The object of his Amendment, he said, was to reinstate the clause in the form in which it was when it was approved by the Joint Committee. He had several consequential Amendments down, and he supposed that it would be most convenient if he said a word or two about them on this Amendment, because if it were rejected it would not be possible for them to deal with its particular application under subsections (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*). By the first subsection the Board of Trade would be able to make an absolute Order—

> "Authorising the construction and equipment of docks, quays, wharves, etc., as are specified in the Order."

That was a very dangerous provision, because in the case of railway companies and every other dock company, if they wanted to make works of this kind they had to get powers by way of private Bill legislation. He did not see why the Port of London should be in a different position from any other undertaking and be freed from the control of Parliament. Considerable alarm was caused to the London County Council by this provision, because the Board of Trade might allow a dock railway to be made under this subsection in places which would have a very bad effect on the general interests of London. Take an extreme case. They might authorise a dock to be made in the City if they were able to acquire the land by agreement. He thought that was a very dangerous extension of the Board of Trade powers, and that they should not be allowed to decide such questions without recourse to Parliament. Subsection (*b*) authorised the purchase and taking otherwise than by agreement of such land as might be specified in the Order. He did not think that the proposal to send down an official to make inquiry would really meet the case. They had been told that no official of the Board of Trade would be appointed; it would have to be an independent arbitrator. He thought that an independent arbitrator was less desirable than an official of the Board of Trade, because they knew that the Board of Trade would at all events have knowledge of precedents, whereas an independent person might not have a knowledge of the usual procedure or of the manner in which Parliament generally dealt with these matters. There undoubtedly would not be the same confidence in the decision of an inexperienced person of that kind as there would be in the decision of a Private Bill Committee of that House. They had had another concession promised, namely, that those undertakings which had got land under statutory powers would be exempted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that the undertaking of the London County Council at Crossness, where there were very extensive sewage works, would be exempted. No doubt this would cover the actual outfall works, but the London County Council wanted to extend those works, and a very much larger area would have to be taken in eventually. If the Port Authority took the land which was required for sewage works, they ought to have some opportunity of laying their views before Parliament, or before some tribunal which would give it very careful consideration.

The clause laid down that no land was to be acquired compulsorily to the west of a line running north and south through Barking Creek. Grays, Southend, and Erith and Gravesend were all to the eastward of this line, and in one case there were cement works in which £7,000,000 of capital had been invested. It was most undesirable to give the Board of Trade power, if it was so advised by an inexperienced person who went down to make an inquiry, to jeopardise the prospects of large undertakings of this kind by taking the only land which might be suitable for their development. He thought the Board of Trade had admitted the danger of acquiring this land compulsorily without recourse to Parliament by this very provision that they were only to do it eastward of this line through Barking Creek. If it was not safe to do it to the west of Barking Creek why was it safe to do it to the east where there were four very large communities and great commercial interests at stake? The other place in which he wanted to insert the necessity for a Provisional Order was in subsection (c) which as it stood would allow the Board of Trade to authorise dues, rates, and tolls in respect of the use of any works proposed to be constructed. The dues, rates, and tolls which might be charged for the undertaking as bought from the dock companies were laid down in the Bill, and there was nothing in this subsection to limit these dues and tolls to the *maxima* which were found necessary in the case of the rest of the dock undertaking. He thought that was undesirable. It was a very important question what were to be the charges. The Port of London after all was a matter of national interest, and he thought the Board of Trade ought to lay these tolls before Parliament, because it might quite easily arise that the tolls might be so high or so ill-advised in various respects that it would be necessary to modify them in order not to endanger the position of the Port. The only subsection where he did not want a Provisional Order was subsection (*d*), and in that he was simply following the decision of the Joint Committee which considered the Bill. It authorised the Port Authority to charge to capital as part of the cost of construction of any work, the interest on any money raised to defray the expense of construction. That was a power which might safely be exercised by the Board of Trade. On the general question he thought the Provisional Order was a means of procedure which involved very little expense to the Port authority. It might involve expense to those whose interests were affected, but that was reasonable enough. If they felt very strongly on the matter, they must be prepared to go to considerable expense in opposing the Provisional Order in Parliament. But he thought if the Board of Trade would only accept this small Amendment, they would really get all they wanted. They had been told that the Port Authority would not want to buy much land. If that was so, perhaps these matters would hardly arise, but he very strongly protested against the tendency of Government Departments to substitute their own initiative for the powers of Parliament. If this went through in its present form a great amount of disquiet would be caused not only in London but in those growing commercial districts to the east of London, and he was quite sure it would not be to the advantage of the Port Authority that at its inception all these interests should be alarmed and prejudiced against it.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

'In line 10, at the end, to insert the words or a Provisional Order as provided in this section.' "—(*Mr. Walter Guinness.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: The question before the Committee is a plain and simple one, because, after all, there is only this issue. Will Parliament give to the new Port Authority that easement and convenience, those facilities in the conduct of their business which are not denied to the great rival ports on the Continent, or will they not? As far as this proposal is concerned, I say, frankly, if I had to choose between accepting the Amendment and dropping the clause, I would drop the clause. I do not believe it would be of the slightest advantage to us. I am advised that it would be much better to revert to the regular system and deny the Port Authority the facilities which are now asked for once and for all. I am advised that procedure by Provisional Order would be just as uncertain, and practically as laborious. In small cases there would be smaller fees to be charged, but in large cases—in any case which raised controversial issues—you would actually have a dual inquiry, the Board of Trade inquiry and the whole Parliamentary procedure in both Houses, in Committee, and so forth. I am advised that that really would be a more inconvenient procedure than to leave it to the ordinary course. I submit to the Committee that although I think the proposal is ingenious, that I know is made in a conciliatory and helpful spirit, the consequences of our adopting it would be worse than the consequences of our not putting in this clause in which we are making great exertions in the interests of the Port authority.

Lord R. CECIL said he could not think the right hon. Gentleman had been correctly advised as to the respective merits of Provisional Order and private Act of Parliament. In the vast majority of cases where Provisional Orders were issued they went through without opposition. Cases of opposition occurred every session without doubt, but he should think they were not 10 per cent. of the Provisional Orders issued and the reason was clear. Where a Provisional Order was employed for the purpose of carrying out small public improvements which did not excite great feeling and opposition, after the local inquiry the Order was allowed to go through without further opposition. Where great interests were involved, and the only people who could tell whether great interests were involved were those who owned them, they were given an opportunity to appeal against the Government Department to Parliament, and they ought to be allowed it. Therefore, the Provisional Order really operated as a kind of sieve, selecting the really important cases for the consideration of Parliament and leaving those which were not of great importance for the consideration of the Department and determination by them. Therefore, he should think if they granted a Provisional Order it would be a very serious advantage to this body. The right hon. Gentleman thought existing conditions were necessary in order to enable competition to be carried out with Continental ports. But surely competition had to be carried out not only with Continental ports but with ports in this country, and he was not sure that it was legitimate to give to one great port a special advantage which they did not give to the others. It appeared to be a matter of very grave doubt if it was in the interests of public policy to put one port in an exceptional position. He should certainly support the Amendment.

*Sir A. SPICER (Hackney, Central) said he was one of the Members of the Joint Committee, and a Member in an official position connected with the London Chamber of Commerce. He was one of those who did not care for the clause as originally put down, but now that the President of the Board of Trade had given them an intimation with regard to the two Amendments that he proposed to add, especially the one providing for a public inquiry, he was prepared to support the Government most heartily. He believed those two Amendments would allay any real ground for suspicion on the part of those who had large interests in the Port of London, and who, in some cases, were competitors of the Port Authority themselves, and he thought now would have all needful protection.

Mr. RENWICK thought the insertion of the words "Provisional Order" would allay a great deal of the alarm caused by the proposals of the clause, but pointed out that while the dues on goods from beyond the seas were limited to one-four-hundredth of their value, there was no stipulation as to the limit of dues on goods carried coastwise, and they might find themselves in the position that goods carried coastwise were saddled with more dues than those carried over-sea. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to accept this Amendment. He had mentioned, not for the first time, that he wanted to give the Port Authority in London the same power as foreign authorities had over foreign ports. But nearly all large ports on the Continent were carried out by State grants and under the direct authority of the State, which was quite a different matter. Unless this question of Provisional Order was agreed to he was afraid the right hon. Gentleman would find that dissatisfaction in London and throughout the Port generally would continue instead of being allayed, and, therefore, he supported the Amendment.

MR. WHITEHEAD said he was reluctant to speak after having withdrawn his own Amendment a moment or two ago, but after the observations of the President of the Board of Trade it seemed to him that they stood in a very curious position. In his first speech, with every word of which he agreed, the right hon. Gentleman laid great stress upon the importance of protecting the Port Authority from the necessity of coming to Parliament when dealing with small parcels of land. He thought it was a very valuable principle that was introduced by the clause. But in his speech a moment ago the right hon. Gentleman said they were dealing with large cases. His speech in support of his present position was entirely inconsistent with the speech in support of the clause as a whole.

MR. CHURCHILL: I was very careful to make it clear that I meant the disadvantages of the Provisional Order system were greatest when the Provisional Order was considered to be of a controversial character—not necessarily that the issues were large, but were controversial in character, or were, perhaps, regarded as controversial by a small number. I do not admit that anything I have said in support of this Amendment has been inconsistent with anything I said before.

MR. WHITEHEAD hoped the right hon. Gentleman would acquit him of any desire to make a personal charge against him, but here they were dealing with very great and important private as well as public interests. So far as the debate had gone, the only assurance the House had that those interests would be properly safeguarded was the promise of the President, and he could not help thinking he was justified at this stage in probing as far as possible what was the real position of the Board of Trade in the matter. It had been said by the Chancellor that the land which would be dealt with was waste land. It was not the first or the second time that that word had been used. The county, a part of which he represented, had a large frontage on the river, and he was told the rateable value of the land which might be affected by the clause in that county alone was something like £3,000,000. They had there very large industrial businesses and important works of various kinds, as well as agricultural land which was by no means waste land, but was of very considerable value. If the Board of Trade looked up the records of the War Office they would find that the price paid for so-called waste land had been not inconsiderable. He looked at the clause to see whether it enabled the authority to deal with large cases. He did not want to give the word any unfair meaning, but in subsection (*a*) power was taken to construct docks and build railways. These were very large undertakings indeed. He did not think anything on that scale had ever been authorised hitherto except by private Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman would agree to limit the operation of the clause to the small cases indicated earlier in the debate, he would not press for a Provisional Order, but if he was going to take the position that the clause as it stood was verbally inspired and that no alteration would be permitted he should reluctantly be obliged to support the Amendment, because only in that way would the large private interests be sufficiently safeguarded.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton) realised most fully the great advantage of being able to acquire small parcels of land or other property without the expense of coming before Parliament by private Bill, but he felt there was great weight in the argument that the new authority was to have an exceptional, if not unprecedented, privilege and yet that that Port Authority was a new, an untried, and an experimental one. The authority was not only new and untried, but it was not yet even in existence. The first authority which would control the finances of the Port of London would be a nominated authority. The second, three years afterwards, which would be put in command of its fortunes, would be practically dictated to by the officials of the Board of Trade which had reserved to itself the right of laying down rules under which the franchise should be employed by the payers of dues. It appeared to him, therefore, that the House ought to be very careful before it parted with its ordinary rights in a matter such as this to an authority whose position was entirely unknown. Most of the speakers had referred to the rights of property and the injury which might result to them if the Port Authority took an arbitrary or an unreasonable view of its rights and privileges. But there was another side to the matter, and to his mind a far more important side, and that was the side which affected the rights and privileges and the risks and responsibilities attaching to those who provided the money for carrying out the schemes of the new Port Authority, and the necessary funds for the improvement of the Port of London. In the past an enormous amount of money had been sunk in unprofitable dock undertakings, and he thought it just as necessary that the interests of the payers of dues, those unfortunate and usually little-considered people who provided the money, should be considered and safeguarded against any rash or ill-advised operations on the part of the new Port Authority as that the interests of the owners of property should be borne in mind. Therefore, he was very sorry the President of the Board of Trade was not willing to put into the clause some definite financial limit which would, to his mind, carry into effect what he understood to be the right hon. Gentleman's own desire that special and unlimited authority should be given regarding small transactions only, and should not be extended to large transactions. That appeared to him to be a very natural course, and if the right hon. Gentleman was not able in some way to meet the point which had been advanced by his hon. friend, he should be reluctantly compelled to vote for the Amendment.

Mr. CHURCHILL said that if it would meet the views of the whole of the Committee and enable them to progress he would be prepared to consider the question of a fixed limit.

Mr. BOWLES said the President of the Board of Trade had stated that he would be willing to consider the question of a fixed limit if that was the general view of the Committee. He could not help thinking that the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman upon this Amendment threw a very strong and clear light upon the real effect of the clause. The right hon. Gentleman told them that if he had to choose between the acceptance of this Amendment, which provided for the Provisional Order procedure, and the clause he would not hesitate to drop the clause because he preferred the present arrangement. What was the difference between the present system and that proposed under the clause? The right hon. Gentleman said the clause would be confined to small undertakings. He wished to point out that such a work as the construction of a dock never could be a small undertaking. Supposing they were to proceed by a Provisional Order as provided by the Amendment instead of adopting the system provided for in the clause. In small matters which did not involve great sums of money or evoke serious opposition, he contended that procedure by Provisional Order would substantially be as good from the point of view of the Port Authority as procedure under this clause. Where there was no opposition the Amendment could do no harm. The difficulties would arise in cases where works were proposed which involved serious opposition on the part of one or more interests concerned. In such a case if they were to proceed by a Provisional Order, no doubt that Order might be opposed, and in that case certain expenses would fall upon the Port Authority. By the clause as it stood the President of the Board of Trade contended that all those expenses would be got rid of. That might be so, but any interest which felt itself seriously aggrieved would have no remedy at all. The point was whether they were going to deprive persons, who might be vitally affected, of the remedy they would have if this Amendment were carried of dealing with the matter under a Provisional Order instead of placing their entire interests in the hands of the Board of Trade. The real object of the clause, and certainly the object of resisting the Amendment, was the natural desire of a Government Department to increase its own authority. The right hon. Gentleman claimed that the Board of Trade would act impartially. That might be true, but it was not a sufficient reason for depriving large interests which might be very seriously prejudiced by works undertaken under this clause of any effectual remedy. He hoped the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken would not be the only member opposite who would see that this was a very serious matter, and that the Amendment provided a way out of the difficulty.

Mr. WATERLOW (Islington, N.) said he should support the Amendment because the clause proposed by the Government was creating a precedent of a very wide-reaching effect. If the authority to purchase land compulsorily with the sanction of the Board of Trade were sanctioned in the case of the Port Authority, many other large public bodies such as county councils, corporations, borough councils, and, in fact, all other large public bodies would seek to have the same power conferred upon them, and they would be perfectly justified in asking for it. He was not aware of a single public authority which possessed such power outside the control of Parliament, and he was sure many county councils would be very glad to have a power of that kind. He did not see how the Government could resist granting that power to other public bodies if they established the precedent in the case of the Port Authority. This was a matter of great importance indeed. The Port Authority would be able to acquire land, but the clause did not state how much land they could acquire, where it was situated, or whether it would have buildings upon it or not. It might be argued that under the clause they could only acquire land, but there was only a very small amount of land that had not some sort of buildings upon it. He took it that they could acquire land belonging to the London County Council with an electric lighting station upon it. That might be an exaggeration, but it seemed to him on the face of it that this was a very wide-reaching proposal, and he should vote for the Amendment.

Mr. ROWLANDS thought the President of the Board of Trade was beginning to realise the wide scope and the vast magnitude of the issues now before the House. They were proposing to give to the Port Authority and the Board of Trade huge powers of acquiring land in every direction, and it was time that some of the officials of the Board of Trade made a journey down the river to investigate the class of property which existed on either side of the river. Besides having the power to acquire land and construct great works, they were proposing to give to this new authority the power to levy, collect, and recover dues, rates, and tolls. The hon. Member for Brixton had just told the Committee how the position of those who had to provide the money for these schemes would be affected by the clause. He was speaking on behalf of a large number of persons who already paid heavy dues for their goods as they came up the river. Those interested in the trade of the river had already had some experience in regard of the payment of extra dues to keep the river in a proper condition under the administration of the Thames Conservancy Board. It was now proposed to give the new Port Authority power to saddle those traders with the cost of works which they might be able to convince Parliament were entirely unnecessary if they had the opportunity of doing so. Therefore, it was very likely that such charges in the future would be very heavy upon the people who had to supply the money all along the Thames. It had been stated in evidence that there were many industries in the lower reaches of the river where goods not of a particularly valuable character were brought into the Port. They were bulky and cheap, but if even a very slightly increased charge was placed upon such goods by the new authority it was quite possible that that trade would be driven outside the Port of London. He trusted the President of the Board of Trade would see his way to concede this point, and then progress might be made with the measure.

SIR F. BANBURY said the President of the Board of Trade had advanced the argument that he was only claiming the same facilities for the Port of London as existed in the case of great Continental ports. That was a very bad argument because Continental ports and Continental nations were governed in a different way. Several hon. Members opposite had advanced some very cogent reasons for supporting the Amendment. The hon. Member for South-East Essex had told them very truly that these powers would deal very harshly with all the people who had invested large sums of money on property along the banks of the river. It had been argued that the privileges asked for had already been granted in the case of light railways and that if they once passed a provision of this sort it would constitute a valuable precedent for other things. It was because he did not want to create such a precedent that he was going to support the Amendment. It had been stated that light railways were in a different position. The promoters of light railways acquired land for the benefit of the neighbourhood, but here it was proposed to allow the Port Authority to buy land to the detriment of people who had invested money in the Port. The hon. Member for Brixton had said that the question had been argued from the point of view of the rights of property, but that there had been no mention of the point of view of those who would be affected by the increase of dues. If so, he thought that was due to an oversight on the part of hon. Members on that side of the House. The Amendment had been moved for two reasons. First of all, they did not want to give the Board of Trade on the application of the new Port Authority the enormous power of making an Order "authorising the construction and equipment of such docks, quays, wharves, jetties, or piers, and buildings, railways and other works in connection therewith as may be specified in the Order." He thought that the hon. Member for Brixton would see that they on that side agreed with him. Really the passing of the clause without the Amendment of his hon. friend opened up a vista from which he shrank with horror. There was absolutely nothing that the Port Authority and the Board of Trade could not do under the clause. The only safeguard he could see was that there would be an inquiry. An inquiry by whom? By the Board of Trade.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have repeatedly said that it would not be by the Board of Trade.

SIR F. BANBURY said the right hon. Gentleman would agree that it was a little difficult to know what was proposed seeing that the Amendment was not on the Paper. But that did not alter his position. He did not wish this power to be given to anybody. He desired to maintain the control of Parliament, and for that reason he supported the Amendment.

*MR. MORTON said he concurred with the last speaker that it was their duty to protect the rights and liberties of Members of Parliament who represented their constituents in these matters. If these were taken away, they might as well leave everything to be arranged by the Government or by a Committee consisting of a few Members of the House without their having an opportunity of submitting to the House the views which their constituents might desire to be urged. He was surprised to find a Liberal Government bringing forward a proposal to take away the rights of the representatives of the people in this House. He should not have been so much astonished if the proposal had come from the other side. He had no doubt that the Board of Trade had its sane moments, but how was he to know when it had those moments? Two years ago when a company of gentlemen proposed to construct a deep-water jetty on the south side of the river two or three miles above Gravesend with money which they themselves were finding, they applied to the Thames Conservancy for the usual licence. The Thames Conservancy were willing to grant the application, but the Board of Trade said that they ought to come to Parliament for power to construct the jetty. What these gentlemen proposed to do was a small matter compared with the enormous undertakings which the Port Authority with the sanction of the Board of Trade would be empowered to carry out if the clause was passed without Amendment. If that was the opinion of the Board of Trade in a small matter of that sort, it appeared to him that Parliament ought to have an opportunity of considering the proposals made by the Port Authority in order that they might be able to judge whether the interests of the people whom they represented were properly protected. He was astonished that the Board of Trade did not give way at once and accept the Amendment. Why did the Board of Trade wish to protect the Port Authority as if it were something sacred? The Committee were not allowed to consider whether the docks ought to be purchased or not. He objected to the Port Authority being able on a Departmental Order to do what was provided for in the clause without coming to Parliament.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that the more he looked into the clause the more disappointed he was. The hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London had pointed out that the setting up of a Commission of inquiry would not afford a sufficient safeguard, and he was disposed to agree with him. It would be noticed that subsection (*a*) gave the Port Authority absolute freedom of action with respect to the construction and equipment of docks, quays, wharves, jetties, piers, buildings, railways, and other works, which might be specified in the Order made by the Board of Trade, but subsection (3) of the new clause, provided that where land was to be acquired compulsorily the sanction of Parliament would be necessary if it appeared to the Board of Trade that that should be applied for.

MR. CHURCHILL: The hon. Gentleman is unduly alarmed. The clause only authorises the Port Authority to construct docks on land within the area which belongs to them.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said it was a very great power to give to the Port Authority. Suppose that the construction of docks, wharves, jetties, piers, and so on, by the Port Authority meant competition with commercial and industrial organisations — suppose that its scheme conflicted with interests already established and contiguous to the Port Authority's interests—was the Port Authority to have independent power, on the Order made by the Board of Trade, to carry out its scheme? The right hon. Gentleman had not thrown any light on the question. The Port Authority would be engaged in a commercial enterprise intent upon making its business pay, and it would compete with various interests which did not enjoy the powers proposed to be conferred on the Port Authority. Did not the Committee see the extremely dangerous position that would set up? If it was right to protect the interests of landowners by sending down a Commissioner where it was proposed to acquire land was it not also right to safeguard in some way commercial interests of various kinds which under the Bill at present had no protection whatever? He submitted that if the Committee allowed the clause to pass without inserting the words of the Amendment, the House would have cause to regret a grave dereliction of duty. What earthly reason could there be for not accepting the Amendment? This was a question of the gravest importance to the commercial interests of the river.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.) said he was heartily in favour of the Port of London Bill, but as the representative of a constituency which had large manufacturing interests which were dependent on cheap freightage he was opposed to any proposal which would have the effect of increasing the cost of production. In his constituency there were potteries which used large quantities of coal, clay, and various other materials, and if a charge was going to be put on them the cost of production would be greatly increased, and the new authority instead of doing good to the Port of London would do harm. This proposal reminded him of some great octopus, which would come sailing up the river, put out its tentacles, and seize land on all sides.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It does not touch a yard of land.

Mr. MYER agreed it did not touch a yard of land, but it touched the materials which were brought up the river. Any charges which the Port Authority might put on goods coming up the river would touch those industries. If the Port Authority got this land without coming to Parliament for powers, they would charge dues on everything that came up the river.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Not at all.

Mr. MYER said he might be wrong, and he would be glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman's explanation. He, at any rate, regarded it as a very serious matter indeed. He might almost say that he had a mandate from a great number of the manufacturers in his constituency to represent their fears of the possible increase in the dues upon the goods on which their livelihood depended.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said his hon. friend had made a speech on the question of the general charges on the river. That had nothing to do with the question before the Committee. The hon. Member said he had a mandate from certain people, but he was too late in redeeming his promise. What was the new clause? He wished his hon. friend had taken the trouble to read it.

Mr. MYER: What about subsection (*c*)?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if his hon. friend had taken the trouble to read the clause he would have seen that his speech was hopelessly irrelevant. The object of the clause was that whenever there was an extension of existing works or whenever land was required for the erection of new works they should have cheap and expeditious methods of acquiring land. He should have thought the hon. Member for Dartford would have been the first to sympathise with an object of that sort. No one had done more than the hon. Member to support the policy of the clause, but when it came to the putting of it into operation he found that there was difficulty in the case. When the Government proposed to put into operation the doctrine which he had put into their minds he jumped up and objected in the interest of some factories in his constituency. The hon. Member pointed to a particular manufacture which he thought would be damaged by this proposition.

Mr. ROWLANDS said that thousands of working men were employed in the manufacture to which he had referred.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE agreed that it was in the interests of these working men that there should be cheap facilities for developing the river. He should have thought that the hon. Member for Dartford would have been the first to sympathise with an object of that sort. Was it in the interests of the working men that the Port Authority should spend thousands of pounds upon Parliamentary lawyers and experts, and hold up the development and extension of works for years and years, because the expense of Parliamentary proceedings could not be faced? They had heard from the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, who objected to the Second Reading, that what happened in these cases was that these little transactions were set aside until a sufficient number of them had accumulated before an application was made to Parliament for powers.

Lord R. CECIL said he did not think that the right hon. Gentleman was quoting him correctly.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was putting in his own words what the noble Lord had said substantially.

Lord R. CECIL said that what he had stated was that a railway company inserted these small transactions in an Omnibus Bill, and that practically meant that they came to Parliament every year, or almost every year.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was all very well in the case of a railway company which might have a system of 400 or 500 miles in extent. But the Port Authority might have only one case in three or four years, and it might have to wait for perhaps ten years before they had such an accumulation of these cases as would make it worth while to go to Parliament for a Bill. There was no doubt of the fact that if the Port Authority were compelled to come to Parliament every time a few acres of land were wanted it would retard the development of the Port. Subsection (*c*) did not mean that the moment they built a jetty on land which they acquired that fresh tolls would be exacted upon all the trade in the river. He did not think that any sane man could put an interpretation of that kind on the subsection. It simply meant that if a jetty were built and a ship came to that particular jetty, it would be subjected to the charges for the use of the jetty. It was just like a Railway Extension Bill which contained a rate clause, and that rate clause was only operative on the particular extension. The clause could not alter the general charges on the river; that would be preposterous.

SIR F. BANBURY said that, as he understood the matter, the money for the extension or for other works would have to be raised, and if the revenue from the works or extension did not pay interest on the capital expended, the general provisions of the Act would then come into force, and the dues would have to be increased.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the clause simply meant that whenever they made an extension the charges which were applicable to the rest of the river should also be applied to that particular extension. This was a clause for the purpose of acquiring land for extension, nothing more. [AN HON MEMBER: Then strike out the other words.] What was the use of acquiring land unless they were allowed to make some use of it? They might as well not buy the land at all. An hon. Member suggested that all they ought to do was to take power to acquire the land, but not power to make use of it. The hon. Member for Sutherland said that the Port Authority should proceed by Provisional Order; but that meant that it would have to go upstairs where it would get exactly the same opposition as was got on an ordinary Private Bill, when it was the interest of every one to pile up and accumulate expenses. All this had been explained and debated over and over again. All that was wanted was a cheap and expeditious method of acquiring land for an extension, and in his opinion there was adequate and complete limitation of the exercise of the powers of the Board of Trade by subsection (3) of the clause.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith) said he was deeply interested in the Bill and was anxious to see it passed. The point which the Committee had been discussing was very largely the outcome of a compromise which had been arrived at. The five London Members of the House of Commons on the Joint Committee thought that this was an honest attempt to get the best machinery for the working of a huge undertaking of this kind. He would point out that the inquiry would be entirely a judicial one, and that the Board of Trade did not suggest that any one particular person should be appointed to conduct the inquiry. They only said that it was to be an independent person. It would not only be an inquiry with regard to the land, but also as to whether any injury would be done to the vendor of the land. It was not to be supposed that the Board of Trade would appoint any one man to conduct this inquiry who was not of the highest character. As a way out of the present difficulty he suggested that the Board of Trade might agree to some limit in the case of money or land or both. The limit for land might be ten acres, which would be sufficient for a dock of considerable size, and the money limit might be £25,000 or £30,000.

SIR F. BANBURY thought that the hon. Member for Lambeth was right in his interpretation of subsection (*a*) that it might involve the acquisition of land for railways away from the riverside works.

MR. CHURCHILL said that he was anxious to respond as far as he possibly could to the appeal made by his hon. friend the Member for Hammersmith, whose interest and attention had been lavished upon the Bill with very great advantage to the measure at every stage. But he did not think they would be making a good Bill, or putting good machinery into the Act of Parliament if they were to insert a sharp, fixed limit either with regard to acreage or with regard to money. They could not stereotype or codify these transactions in that way. He was, however, prepared to defer to a certain extent to those who used the argument that these transactions were being witheld from Parliament, but while he said that he must insist that the Minister representing the Board of Trade in this House was responsible to Parliament for every act done by his Department. In order to make progress with the Bill he was prepared to insert a new subsection after subsection (3) providing that: "An Order other than a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under this section for the acquisition of land shall not take effect until a draft thereof has been laid for thirty days on the Tables of both Houses of Parliament, and if either House during these thirty days presents an address to His Majesty against the draft, no further proceedings shall be taken thereon, but without prejudice to the laying of a new Order." That would be following out the suggestion which fell earlier in the afternoon from hon. Members on those benches, and it would keep the whole of this procedure within the action of Parliament. If Parliament did not wish to admit the dispensing power, or thought it was an improper exercise of it, it would be within the power of Parliament by a most simple and effective procedure to terminate the whole transaction.

Sir F. BANBURY suggested that in order to expedite matters they should divide on the question of Provisional Orders and discuss the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion afterwards.

***Mr. WALTER GUINNESS** said the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman did something to meet their case, but did not go half far enough in regard to the point as to having a Provisional Order. Neither the right hon. Gentleman nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to realise the strong objection they had to sub-heads (*a*) and (*b*).

***The CHAIRMAN** said they were not discussing sub-heads (*a*) and (*b*). They only came in as pertaining to this particular Amendment.

Mr. WALTER GUINNESS pointed out that if his Amendment was rejected in line 10, and as he took it, it would be, it would be out of order for him to move to put in the word "Provisional" before the word "Order" in line 14.

***The CHAIRMAN:** Oh, yes, of course, it would; it applies to the whole of the paragraph.

***Mr. WALTER GUINNESS** said this was the only opportunity of discussing the question of having a Provisional Order to deal with the construction or equipment of "docks, quays, wharves, jetties or piers and buildings, railways and other works in connection therewith." But he would only say one word. He did not think either of the right hon. Gentlemen who had spoken for the Government had attached so much importance as they ought to this matter, and although they had an illusory compromise in regard to subhead (*b*) they had been offered no compromise in regard to sub-heads (*a*) or (*c*). The Government had ignored that and the local authorities would be very much affected by that, and he could imagine the House being affected by it. What was to prevent the Port Authority from acquiring St. Thomas' Hospital and putting up creaking cranes there.

Mr. CHURCHILL said he was very anxious to meet the wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and suggested that if he were to leave out from his proposed new subsection the words "for the acquisition of land," then the Amendment would apply to all those matters. He was ready to do that.

Sir F. BANBURY said that they must divide on the question of the Provisional Order.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 36; Noes, 185. (Division List No. 431.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
M'Arthur, Charles
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seaverns, J. H.
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester
Verney, F. W.
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Walter Guinness and Mr. Bowles.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Frances Dyke
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, R. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Carr-Gomm, W. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Hedges, A. Paget
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C. (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter

Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Rt.Hn. H.L.(Cleveland
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G.R (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt.HnSirThomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. WHITEHEAD said he would not move the two Amendments next on the Paper, but he proposed to move the one suggesting in line 16, after the word "land" the insertion of the words "and subject to such conditions and reservations." The Amendment was more of a drafting character than anything else. While the Commissioners were to direct that the land should be purchased they had no power to indicate conditions or insert in the Order reservations in favour of the landowner. He thought it was clear that the clause should be amended in this direction.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 16, after the word 'land,' to insert the words 'and subject to such conditions and reservations.'"—(*Mr. Whitehead.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to say that this would be a dangerous Amendment, and he certainly should not claim on behalf of the Board of Trade or any other Department the powers which his hon. friend would entrust to them. It was much better that the matter should be fought right out. He hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHURCHILL formally moved in fulfilment of a promise made earlier in the discussion an Amendment withholding from the scope of the clause all lands which had been acquired under statutory powers.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 31, to insert after the word 'Greenwich,' the words 'or which has been acquired by the owners thereof under statute.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendment agreed to.

SIR F. BANBURY said, to put himself in order, he would move a proviso standing on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Member for the Epping division of Essex, to the effect that nothing in the Bill should empower the Board of Trade to authorise the purchase and taking of any land belonging to any railway company, used as part of or in connection with their railway and acquired under Acts relating to their undertaking. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had moved an Amendment dealing with this question, but he was afraid he did not hear the words, which were not on the Paper. He therefore moved this in order to give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of explaining the matter. If the Amendment were covered he would withdraw it, but he begged to move it formally.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 36, at end, to insert the words 'Provided also that nothing herein contained shall empower the Board of Trade to authorise the purchase and taking of any land belonging to any railway company and used by such company as a part of or in connection with their railway and acquired by such company under any of the provisions of the Acts relating to their undertaking.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL explained that the Amendment which had already been inserted had the effect of withdrawing from the scope of the clause all lands which were possessed under statutory authority and which had been acquired under any statute, and that was the better way of doing it. They had not named railways, although railways were included.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHURCHILL formally moved another Amendment, also promised earlier in the debate, viz., to insert at the beginning of subsection (3), words to the effect that before formulating an Order under this subsection the Board of Trade should appoint an impartial person to hold a public inquiry on its behalf.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 45, at the beginning of subsection (3) to insert the words 'Before formulating an Order under this subsection the Board of Trade shall appoint an impartial person to hold an inquiry on its behalf.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR GILBERT PARKER inquired whether the right hon. Gentleman would not only include in that Amendment a scheme for the acquisition of land but also any other scheme, such as one for the construction of docks. He did not think the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman would be satisfactory unless the change was made so that the inquiry would include the general items.

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to assent to the proposal.

MR. RENWICK asked the right hon. Gentleman to insert words giving all the people interested power to give evidence before the inquiry.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes: there will be a public inquiry.

AN HON. MEMBER thought it might be as well to insert some words, because only the other day under the working of the Small Holdings Act great hardship was caused by interested parties not being allowed to be heard by counsel. The insertion of words could do no harm.

MR. RENWICK expressed the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to insert some words.

MR. CHURCHILL thought "public inquiry" was sufficient. If interested parties were not heard they would be able to make a protest, and if that protest was audible the whole system of our Government institutions would come into operation. He was very unwilling to cumber the Bill with particular drafting.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he understood that the right hon. Gentleman was willing to move an Amendment or accept an Amendment striking out these words. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would withdraw the Amendment and move it in a new form.

MR. CHURCHILL: Certainly.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"To leave out subsection (3), and to insert the words '(3) Before making an order under this section the Board of Trade shall appoint an impartial person to hold a public inquiry on their behalf, and if he reports or if it appears to the Board of Trade that by reason of the extent or situation of any land proposed to be acquired compulsorily, or the purposes for which such land is used, or any other circumstances, the land ought not to be acquired compulsorily without the sanction of Parliament the order of the Board shall be provisional only and shall not have effect unless confirmed by Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words '(4) Any order other than a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under this section shall not take effect until a draft thereof has lain for thirty days on the Table of both Houses of Parliament, and if either House during those thirty days presents an address to His Majesty against the draft no further proceedings shall be taken thereon but without prejudice to the making of a new order.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Mr. RENWICK asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would insert after the words "thirty days" the words "while Parliament is sitting."

Mr. CHURCHILL understood that such an order could only lie for thirty days on the Table while Parliament was in session. If the House was not sitting it could not lie, but this matter had come upon him rather unexpectedly, and in his desire to meet the wishes of the House, he would accept such an Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, after the word 'days,' to insert the words 'during the session of Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Renwick.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

*Mr. MORTON, in moving a new clause relating to tolls and levies, said that at the present time the Government ships had full use of the waterway and paid nothing toward the upkeep of the Port or the dredging of the fairway, and his object in asking this clause to be inserted was that these ships should, with others, pay a fair share towards the cost. The right hon. Gentleman might tell them it could not be done, but the same thing was done in the case of rates on buildings, and as it was done in that case, he asked that it should be done in the case of the river. He knew that the Government said in the case of the rates on buildings that it was a matter of grace; but it was sufficient to show that it was done. In his opinion the Government ships ought to pay their fair share towards the cost of the upkeep of the Port in the same way as others paid. He begged to move.

New clause—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in the Act of 54 Geo. III., c. 159, the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, or any Act amending the same, any rates, dues, tolls, fees, or other charges leviable under this Act, or under any Provisional Order made thereunder, or under any Act incorporated therewith, shall be chargeable to and payable by the Crown upon the same conditions and in the same manner as they are chargeable to and payable by other bodies or persons.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. CHURCHILL expressed some doubt whether, as this would impose a charge upon the Exchequer, it was in order. He would simply say that the passage of His Majesty's ships up the Thames without payment of charges was only the practice followed in every port in the kingdom, and it was the invariable practice of Parliament to allow the exemption. The Bill made the new authority heirs to all the right and obligations of the present authorities and it would not be in accordance with the principle of the Bill to insert such a clause.

Mr. MYER felt he must support any proposal that would tend to make London a cheaper port. It was not quite the case that in all ports the Government were free from such charges. In Portsmouth Harbour the cost of dredging, buoying, and clearing the fairway was largely borne by the Government. As such a clause as this would lighten the burden of London and make the port a cheap port, he was in favour of it.

*Mr. MORTON said the objections were similar to those urged against the payment of rates by the Crown, but finally the Government yielded with regard to that as they said an act of grace, and he would have been satisfied if he could have got an assurance in that direction. He did not intend to divide on the clause.

Proposed new clause negatived.

*Mr. MORTON, in moving a new clause to provide for dock and river accounts to be kept separately, said that this was possibly the most important clause that had yet been proposed. In it he asked that the accounts in connection with the docks and the river should be kept separate. This matter had been discussed by the Joint Committee and had only been defeated by two votes, and that was at the instigation of the dock companies who apparently did not want the true state of affairs to be known. The clause provided that the accounts of all the money spent on the improvements of the docks should be kept separately from those of the money spent on the improvements of the river, and that the dock receipts should be kept separate from the river receipts. He was astonished that there should be any objection to the clause. Certainly no reason for such an objection could be given except the desire of the dock companies that their profits or losses should be kept secret. At the present time they wanted to tax the food of the people in order to make up the loss that must occur with regard to the docks. This principle was carried out at Liverpool in regard to the Mersey Docks and Harbour. Section 55 of the Act governing the Port provided that no portion of the Conservancy receipts for the use of the river should be applied to dock expenses, and by asking for the insertion of this clause he was only asking for what Parliament insisted upon in the case of the Mersey docks. It could hardly therefore be considered an extraordinary proposition. In the case of London the chief source of revenue was the power to charge dues on all goods coming into London, and that depended so far as the dock companies were concerned upon whether they were brought into the docks or handled in the river. That was another reason for this separation of accounts, because a good deal depended upon the amount of business that was handled in the river. Up to about twenty years ago there were two different authorities for the government of the Thames. The old Conservancy (the Corporation) had charge from Southend to Staines, and for the upper portions of the Thames there was a Board composed of all the owners of the land adjoining the river. That was found to be a bad system. What did Parliament do then? Parliament insisted that there must be separate accounts kept of the upper and the lower river. These had been kept ever since, and, speaking as a member of the Conservancy, he could say that there was no difficulty at all in keeping them separate and the very fact that they were separate was of great use to them in carrying out the work and the control of the river. He was astonished that the President of the Board of Trade advised the Joint Committee to object to this, and he had not heard why, except the statement of Sir E. Clarke, counsel for the London and India Docks Company, who said that the Amendment to give them separate accounts would be fatal to the Bill; that it interfered with the structure of the Bill in a serious manner. What that all meant he had never heard and probably never would hear, and he could not understand the necessity for all this secrecy, unless there was something like the engineer's report that they were afraid even to show the Joint Committee. The dock companies had a curious power over the Joint Committee, excepting the Members of the House of Lords on the Committee, who were not frightened so easily. He was sorry that that Committee was not more independent and did not take into consideration that it was there representing at any rate the people of London, if not the people of the country, and not simply acting as agents for the dock companies, to get rid of their shares, he supposed, and unload them on to the public. He would be very pleased if the President of the Board of Trade would at once give way and agree to the clause, because it would astonish him if the right hon. Gentleman had any good reason why they should not have the accounts kept separately, as was done in the case of the Mersey and other Port authorities, and even in the case of the Port of London itself. That being so, he begged to move the new clause.

New clause proposed—

"The following accounts shall be kept separately by the Port Authority in addition to any other accounts which are by this Act prescribed to be kept as separate accounts, that is to say:—(1) An account (to be called the Docks Capital Account) showing: (*a*) The amount of port stock created and issued in substitution for the existing stocks of the dock companies; (*b*) the amount of money expended by the Port Authority on capital account in improving the docks, basins, cuts, and entrances by this Act transferred to the Port Authority or in constructing and equipping new docks, basins, cuts, entrances, and other works or otherwise on capital account in improving the Port of London. (2) An account (to be called the Docks Revenue Account): (*a*) Of all sums received in respect of vessels entering, lying in, departing from, or otherwise using the docks, basins, cuts, or entrances from time to time vested in the Port Authority other than the duties of tonnage prescribed in Section 155 of the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, as amended by Section 7 of the Thames Conservancy Act, 1905, and by this Act and in respect of all goods imported into or exported from such docks, basins, cuts, and entrances, and in respect of services rendered or accommodation provided by the Port Authority within the same and of all other revenue received by the Port Authority in respect thereof (to be called Dock Receipts); (*b*) of all sums expended in respect of the maintenance, management, and improvement of the Port of London, including all sums paid by way of interests on or redemption of money expended on Dock Capital Account (to be called Dock Expenditure). (3) An account (to be called the River Capital Account) showing: (*a*) The amount of port stock created and issued under this Act in substitution for Thames Conservancy Redeemable 'A' Debenture Stock; (*b*) such amount of the money expended by the Port authority on capital account as, in the opinion of the auditor of the Port Authority, is capital expenditure necessitated by the requirements of persons and vessels not using the said docks, basins, cuts, and entrances of the Port authority. (4) An account (to be called the River Revenue Account): (*a*) Of all sums received from the said duties of tonnage and in respect of all vessels, goods, services, and accommodation, other than the vessels, goods, services, and accommodation referred to in subsection (2) (*a*) of this section, and of all other revenue received by the Port Authority (to be called river receipts); (*b*) of all sums paid: (1) by way of interest on or redemption of money expended on River Capital Account; (2) such proportion of the expenditure referred to in subsection (2) (*b*) of this section as, in the opinion of the auditor of the Port Authority, is expenditure necessitated by the requirements of persons and vessels not using the said docks, basins, cuts, and entrances of the Port Authority (to be called river expenditure). (5) The dock expenditure shall be defrayed out of the dock receipts and the river expenditure shall be defrayed out of the river receipts, and no portion of the river receipts shall be applied in aid of the dock expenditure."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHURCHILL: The sting of the proposed new clause is in its tail, in subsection (5). The effect of saying that no surplus on the river trade shall be devoted to balancing a deficit on the dock trade, or *vice versa*, would be seriously to impair the financial structure of the Bill and would upset the bargain which the House has decided to enter upon. I therefore say that it is impossible for me to accept that Amendment. I think I have already gone a long way to meet the views of hon. Gentlemen on this subject when I accepted the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington, which does arrange that the receipts from Port rates shall be separately published, but I think it would be impracticable to go beyond that. I do not think the case of the Mersey Board is on all fours with that of London. There is no free water trade in respect of goods in the docks at Liverpool, and the passing trade on the way up to Manchester and elsewhere does not in any way participate in the hospitalities of the Port in the same way as in London. The Amendment was very carefully considered by the Committee, and after much examination they rejected it; and that is the only course I find open to me.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he was in agreement with the right hon. Gentleman in regard to subsection (5), but he really thought it extraordinary that the right hon. Gentleman was not able to accept the rest of the Amendment. The position regarding the Port of London was a very difficult one. The right hon. Gentleman knew that they had really two sets of interests on the river, the dock interests and the river interests. They were sharply distinct. The Government, he had no doubt, wished to co-ordinate and to harmonise those two sets of interests, but that could not be done so long as there was a strong element of suspicion on the part of the various interests which were competitive, though not opposed, to the docks. It had been common talk outside the House that the right hon. Gentleman was going to accept this Amendment. It was the general impression among those representing the river interests that this separation of the two accounts, the docks capital account and the docks revenue account from the river capital account and the river revenue account, was going to be agreed to, and it seemed to him to be an entirely reasonable suggestion. He thought it would be subversive of the best interests of the river ultimately if they were to say that revenue proceeding from river interests should only be devoted to certain specific river interests, and the same with regard to the docks; but if the accounts were simply kept separate, the public—the commercial public, the river public—would be able to see exactly what the position was, and could from year to year find out the proportions of expenditure.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think the point is sufficiently met by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington's proviso, in Clause 23, subsection (1), which says that—

> "All receipts from port rates on goods discharged from, or taken on board, ships not within the dock premises of the Port Authority shall be shown separately from the receipts from port rates on goods discharged from or taken on board ships within such premises."

Why does that not meet the case?

*MR. MORTON: I am advised that that does not meet the case at all.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said it did not meet the whole case. In that clause they had only the showing of the revenue, whereas in the Amendment of the hon. Member they had the capital accounts separated, whereby they could see exactly what the position of the original capital was, and its relation to the subsequent revenue under the new Act. He did not think the Amendment was acceptable to the Committee as it stood, and therefore, in view of the great difficulty of the situation, the dissatisfaction that existed, the suspicion and uncertainty that existed among those representing the river interests, he thought the right hon. Gentleman would do well to consider the advisability of adding to the clause that the dock capital accounts should be kept separately as well as the revenue accounts.

MR. CHURCHILL thought the proper place to raise that question would be on Clause 23.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked if, in view of what the right hon. Gentleman had said, he would give any kind of assurance that when the matter came up on the Report stage he would assent to this division.

MR. CHURCHILL: When we reach the proper place in the Bill where this should be discussed, I will give my most undivided attention to any statement the hon. Gentleman may then make, and will do the fullest justice to any argument he may advance.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked whether he understood that the view of the right hon. Gentleman, as at present advised, was that it would be inexpedient so far as could be seen to separate the dock capital account from the river capital account. That would govern his own action in the matter very largely.

MR. CHURCHILL: I should suppose that the proper distribution of the capital account between the dock trade and the river interests would emerge from the regularly compiled accounts of the Port Authority. So far as the receipts are concerned, there is an Amendment that they shall be kept separately, but so far as the expenditure is concerned, the separation of those accounts, I am informed, is impossible.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) thought it well to interrupt this question and answer proceeding between the hon. Gentleman and the right hon. Gentleman. He desired to acknowledge with all gratitude the concession made to him at an earlier stage, but he must point out that it was of a very limited character and did not go at all the length of the clause now before them. The clause was, except as regarded one part of it, a most excellent clause, and it had been fully discussed in another place. It was like clauses which existed in other statutes, and he thought it required more consideration than it had received in that debate. There was one fault in the argument of the hon. Member who moved the clause; he did not say a word in defence of subsection (5), and of course he was pounced upon and torn in pieces by the right hon. Gentleman for that neglect. He argued all from his first four sections. The clause was entirely devoted to the keeping of the accounts separate, except subsection (5), which was dragged in to dictate as to the source from which certain money should be paid. It was irrelevant to the clause altogether, and his hon. friend did not give a single reason in support of that subsection. His right hon. friend, if he might say so, made just the same kind of mistake; he devoted his answer entirely to subsection (5). He would like to suggest that they should leave out the tail of the clause, and that the right hon. Gentleman should accept the clause without subsection (5). He regarded it as of the very greatest importance. He had taken some pains to set out how the accounts of local authorities which were set up should be kept, and there was never a case in which it would be of greater importance than to the mercantile community of London that they should have these accounts kept in clear form, and the receipts and expenditure under all heads kept perfectly distinct. He did not think a single objection to the first four subsections had been stated, and he would suggest, as a step that would go far to promote harmony, that the right hon. Gentleman should accept the new clause, leaving out subsection (5). He pressed that upon him with some confidence, because he had already been the recipient of a small favour with regard to the dues on goods. There did not appear to him to be a single item in this long clause that would not be necessary and useful to the mercantile community of London and very helpful to the Board of Trade in watching the affairs of this new authority hereafter.

Mr. RENWICK said he supported the clause. He had listened to the whole of the debate and had come to the conclusion that the Committee had never recognised the importance of this matter to the two interests affected, namely, the dock interest and the river interest. They could never be reconcilable, and the extraordinary thing in regard to them was that no improvement of the river or docks contemplated by the Bill could be of any use or benefit whatever to the ships which used the river. They were perfectly satisfied with the present accommodation and with the depth of water, and they were naturally jealous that in any improvements of the docks—and there would be very large improvements, with an enormous outlay possibly—their interests should not be sacrificed, and therefore they were most anxious to have these accounts kept separately. He could understand the right hon. Gentleman if he said he would agree to the clause, say, for a period of five or ten years. This was a new authority that was to be set up, and no one knew what amount of money the authority would spend, but they all knew very well that the amount spent would be very large, and naturally those whose interests were affected adversely by the money spent were anxious that the river interests should not be handicapped to provide funds to improve the docks. Therefore, it was absolutely necessary that the accounts should be kept separately. He was sincerely sorry that in the whole of the debate the Committee had never recognised the enormous value of the riverside trade. If any Member of the Committee were to take a walk in that direction on a Monday or a Tuesday morning he would see the Pool and the wharves there crowded with shipping, none of which used the docks. The accommodation for that shipping had been provided by private enterprise, but the owners of these wharves did not come and ask for money to develop their wharves. They did it themselves, and naturally they said that if this new authority was to deal with the docks it should not be at the expense of the riverside trade. He therefore appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to accept this very reasonable Amendment, including subsection (5), which set forth that no portion of the money that was raised by the revenue of the river should be used in improving the docks, or *vice versa*.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am afraid I cannot entertain the Amendment. The whole matter was considered by the Committee who rejected a clause almost identical with this after very careful examination. The Chairman said—

> "We feel we can safely rely on the Board of Trade to give all the information useful to those who have introduced this Amendment."

That refers to the power which the Board of Trade have under Section 2 (*b*) of prescribing the form of the accounts. We shall prescribe the form of these accounts in the manner best calculated to give the fullest information to traders and the general public that can be given them without unduly hampering with pettifogging and vexatious restrictions the work of the authority. I would ask the Committee to come to a decision upon this matter now. We have made very slow progress to-day, and I earnestly submit to the Committee that I have done my best to avoid points of dissatisfaction. I should still be ready to consider any Amendment which may be moved with a view to making concessions wherever possible, having regard to the position of the Bill.

Mr. MYER said there could be no doubt that there might be an attempt on the part of the new Port Authority to put these charges upon the goods which went to the wharves and private properties on each side of the river which had been put up at great expense by the riparian owners. There was an enormous amount of trade depending upon their free access to these wharves, and he regretted that he could not support the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. CHURCHILL rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That the clause be read a second time."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 15; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 432.)

AYES.

Balcarres, Lord
Clive, Percy Archer
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hills, J. W.
Jenkins, J.
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
M'Arthur, Charles
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Rowlands, J.
Waterlow, D. S.

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr Morton and Mr. Myer.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs.

Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathenial
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, John (Galway, East
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Rt. Hn. H. L. (Cleveland
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Master of Elibank and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

And, it being after Five of the Clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. CHURCHILL rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

MR. MACARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale), on a point of order, said he had a new clause to be introduced on the Report stage. Would that be precluded by the Motion to report the Bill?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member does not seem to know that we are discussing merely the new clauses in Committee which were on the Paper on 12th November. Our proceedings have nothing whatever to do with the Report Stage.

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House," put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 390.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS (ADMISSION OF STRANGERS).

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Rules and Regulations under which Strangers are admitted to this House and its precincts; and to report whether any alterations in the same are expedient.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Five o'clock, till Monday next.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXCVII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Children	*Earl Beauchamp*	Read 3^a and passed 30th November (1035)
*Education (Scotland)	*Lord Herschell*	Read 1^a 25th November (370)
Incest	*Bishop of St. Albans*	Read 2^a 2nd December (1408) Committee 3rd December(1597)
Law of Distress Amendment	*Lord Courtney of Penwith*	Report 3rd December (1594)
*Licensing	*Earl of Crewe*	Second Reading 25th November (280) Second Reading 26th November (538) Second Reading (defeated) 27th November (828)
Local Registration of Title (Ireland)	*Lord Atkinson*	Read 2^a 1st December (1230)
Post Office Consolidation [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 3^a and passed 24th November (23)

(B) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Appelate Jurisdiction [H.L.]	*Sir W. Robson*	Read 1^o 24th November (133) Read 2^o 3rd December (1754)
Assizes and Quarter Sessions [H.L.]	*Mr. O. Williams*	Read 2^o 2nd December (1392) Committee 3rd December (1756)
*Companies Consolidation	*Sir H. Kearley*	Read 2^o 3rd December (1755)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Education (Scotland)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Report } 24th Nov. Read 3^{a} and passed } (147)
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2)	*Mr. Runciman*	Second Reading 25th November (417) Read 2^{a} 26th November (707) Allocation of Time 27th November (943) Committee 30th November [1107) Committee 1st December (1276) Committee 2nd December (1476)
Lunacy [H.L.]	*Sir W. Robson*	Read 1^{o} 24th November (133)
Meat Marking (Ireland)	*Mr. Field*	Read 1^{o} 24th November (134)
*Poisons and Pharmacy [H.L.]	*Mr. H. Samuel*	Read 2^{o} 3rd December (1710)
*Port of London	*Mr. Lloyd George*	Report 4th December (1767)
*Post Office Consolidation [H.L.]	*Mr. Buxton*	Read 1^{o} 27th November (943)
*Prevention of Crime	*Mr. Gladstone.*	Report 24th November (221)
Roman Catholic Disabilities (Removal)	*Mr. W. Redmond*	Read 1^{o} 24th November (134)
*White Phosphorus Matches (Prohibition)	*Mr. Gladstone*	Report } 3rd Dec. Read 3^{o} and passed } (1746)

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

NOVEMBER 24—*DECEMBER* 4.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen

Fish Carriage on Railway—Legislation to prevent Delay proposed.
Qs. Mr. Pirie; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1453.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]

Kildorrery—Case of J. McGrath, *Nov. 26*, 696.

McCausland Estate—Case of Mrs. M. Rice, *Dec. 3*, 1623.

Acland, Mr. F. D.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Yorkshire, Richmond]

Sherwood Foresters, 7th Battalion, Uniform, etc., of, *Nov. 24*, 92, 93.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A. [Somersetshire, Wellington]

Business of the House, Course of, *Dec. 3*, 1756.

Adkins, Mr. W. R. [Lancashire, S.E., Middleton]

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 787–791; *Com., Dec. 1*, 1345–1347, 1376; *Dec. 2*, 1497–1501.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 975.

Admiralty

Flour Contracts—Amount rejected.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 377.

Admiralty—*cont.*

Rum purchased (1906–8).
Qs. Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 2*, 1444.

Timber Contract with Foreign Firms—Remedy against Default.
Qs. Earl of Ronaldshay; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 1*, 1245.

Afghanistan

Gun-running, Proposals for Preventing.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 1*, 1254.

Africa, East

[*For particular Places, see their Names, as* Uganda, *etc.*]

Sick Leave of Officials, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 27*, 937.

Africa, South

[*For particular Colonies, etc., see their Names, as* Transvaal.]

Naval Squadron, Visit of—Farewell Message of Admiral.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. R. Harcourt; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 25*, 390.

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill

Proposals as to.
Os. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Earl of Crewe, *Dec. 2*, 1425.

Agriculture and Fisheries Board
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Constitution, Pay and Number of Meetings of.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 26*, 683.
Grant in England.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Fuller, *Dec. 3*, 1679.
Meeting to consider Expediting of Small Holdings Business, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 30*, 1093.
Reconstruction, proposed.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 1*, 1275.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Vice-President—Rt. Hon. T. W. Russell.
Funds devoted to Agriculture.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1702.
Hay and Straw, Power to Prohibit Landing of.
Q. Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 25*, 379.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 153.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Unemployed Workmen Act, Section 2 (3), Returns under, *Nov. 24*, 116.

Aldridge Colliery
Accidents at.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 641.

Aliens
Children of Deported Persons—Case of Schafer.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 670.

Aliens Act
Administration of—Definition of "Immigrant Ship," etc.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *Dec. 2*, 1412–1415; Earl Beauchamp, 1415; Viscount Ridley, 1416. Marquess of Lansdowne, 1417

All-British Mail Route
Progress of Negotiations.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 30*, 1083.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill—Allocation of Grants, *Dec. 4*, 1759.

Anæsthetics
Administration of—Case of A. Lebathe.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 655.

Ancient Monuments
English Commission, Constitution of.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 24*, 132.

Annalong Harbour
Lamps, Responsibility for Lighting.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 25*, 380.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 451–458; *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1144, 1200–1202; *Dec. 1*, 1339, 1343, 1371; *Dec. 2*, 1492.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1573. 1575, 1583–1590.
Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, Effect on, *Dec. 2*, 1461, 1462.

Anstruther-Gray, Major [St. Andrews Burghs]
Ancient Monuments, English Commission—Constitution of, *Nov. 24*, 132, 133.
Hayti Disturbances—Protection of British Subjects, *Nov. 26*, 664.
Persian Constitution, Granting of, *Nov. 26*, 666.

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill
c. 1R.* *Nov. 24*, 133.
2R., *Dec. 3*, 1754.

Ardess
School—Case of Miss G. Knox.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 89.

Armagh
Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Case of J. Moore.
Q. Mr. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 409.
Land Purchase Transactions to Date.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1097.

Army
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.
Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.
Bandsmen—Training at Kneller Hall.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 30*, 1053.
Barracks, Insanitary, Return as to, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 30*, 1071.
Carrickfergus, Military Designation of.
Q. Colonel McCalmont; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 26*, 658.
Cavalry—Distribution System.
Qs. Mr. Ashley, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 30*, 1070.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Cork Barracks, Labour Employed on.
  Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 26*, 653.

Engineer Services, Royal—Payment of Removal Expenses.
  Qs. Mr. E. Griffith; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 26*, 659.

Expenditure of Great Britain and certain Foreign Countries.
  Q. Mr. Maddison; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1656.

Garrisoning of Stations Abroad, Provision for.
  Os. Earl of Erroll, *Dec. 3*, 1603; Lord Lucas, 1603.

Guns—Howitzer Trials.
  Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 30*, 1072.

Horses' Oats, System of Supplying.
  Qs. Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 2*, 1449.

Infantry Battalions, Strength of.
  Q. Mr. Godfrey Baring; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1654.

Inniskilling Dragoons—Promotions and Transfers.
  Qs. Captain Faber, Earl Winterton; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 2*, 1450.

Irish Command, Constitution and Training of.
  Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 30*, 1071.

Loan Expenditure.
  Os. Viscount Midleton, *Dec. 3*, 1605, 1609; Lord Lucas, 1605; Earl of Crewe, 1608, 1609.

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Officers

  Colonels on Half-pay, System of Appointing.
    Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 25*, 387.

  Tailors recommended to.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1638.

Reserve—Strength on Mobilisation.
  Os. Earl of Erroll, *Dec. 3*, 1600; Lord Lucas, 1601.

Soldiers

  Boot-making, Instruction in.
    Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 2*, 1451.

  Training for Civil Employment.
    Qs. Mr. H. C. Lea, Mr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 2*, 1452.

    Report Presented, *Nov. 26*, 537, 638.

Special Reserve, Strength of.
  Os. Earl of Erroll, *Dec. 3*, 1598, 1599; Lord Lucas, 1602.

Army—*cont.*

Strength of Compared with Three Years Ago.
  Os. Earl of Erroll, *Dec. 3*, 1597–1601; Lord Lucas, 1601–1604, 1611; Viscount Midleton, 1604–1607, 1611; Earl of Crewe, 1608; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1611.

Territorial Force

  Decorations for Transferred Volunteers.
    Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1638.

  Efficiency Medal, Conditions of Granting.
    Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1639.

  Guns for.
    Q. Earl Winterton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 26*, 654.

  Musketry Training

    Committee, Names of.
      Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1640.

    Instructional Practices.
      Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1643.

    Marking and Supervision.
      Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1643.

    Wind-Gauge, Use of.
      Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1644.

  Organisation of.
    Os. Earl of Crewe, *Dec. 3*, 1608, 1610; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1610.

  Re-engagement, Procedure as to.
    Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1640.

  Sherwood Foresters, Seventh Battalion, Uniform, etc., of.
    Qs. Mr. Richardson; *As.* Mr. Acland, *Nov. 24*, 92.

War Office, *see that title.*

Woolwich Arsenal, *see that title.*

Arnold-Forster Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]

Africa, East—Regulations as to Sick Leave of Officials, *Nov. 27*, 937.

Ashbourne, Lord

Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 848–853.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill, 2R., *Dec. 1*, 1232.

'Ashburton'.

Crew of.
  Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1455.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]
Army
Barracks, Insanitary, Return as to, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1071.
Cavalry—Distribution System, *Nov. 30*, 1070.
Guns—Howitzer Trials, *Nov. 30*, 1072.
Irish Command, Constitution and Training of, *Nov. 30*, 1071.
Education Board
Circular 576, Cause for Issuing, *Nov. 25*, 399, 400.
Circular 596—Wording of Paragraph 7 (*a*), *Nov. 25*, 398, 399.
Medical Officers, *Status* of, *Nov. 25*, 399.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1127; *Dec. 1*, 1357–1358, 1361; *Dec. 2*, 1495–1497, 1518, 1528.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 967, 1005–1008.
Clause 2—Right of Entry in Single-Room Schools, *Dec. 1*, 1261.
Indian Army Pay, Increase of, *Dec. 3*, 1664.
Irish Land Bill—Effect on Payment of Bonus, *Nov. 26*, 654.
Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Dec. 1*, 1247; *Dec. 2*, 1446.

Ashton, Mr. T. G. [Bedfordshire, Luton]
Old-Age Pensions—Case of Husband of Woman in Receipt of Poor Relief, *Dec. 4*, 1762.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Fife, E.]
Agriculture Board—Reconstruction proposed, *Dec. 1*, 1275.
Ancient Monuments English Commission Constitution of, *Nov. 24*, 132, 133.
Bills—House of Lords' Opinion, Ascertaining before Taking Committee Stage in House of Commons, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1104.
Business of the House, Course of, *Nov. 24*, 133; *Nov. 30*, 1107; *Dec. 3*, 1708, 1709.
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill—Proposals as to, *Nov. 26*, 700; *Dec. 3*, 1707.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 455, 456; *Nov. 26*, 723–731; *Nov. 30*, 1145–1147, 1149; *Dec. 1*, 1284–1290.
Allocation of Time to, *Nov. 25*, 415, 416; *Nov. 26*, 703, 704; *Nov. 27*, 944–950, 955, 963, 966–968, 1011–1014.
Negotiations, Result of, *Nov. 30*, 1105.
Questions on, *Dec. 2*, 1475.
Withdrawal of, *Dec. 2*, 1475; *Dec. 4*, 1766.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
Indian Administrative Reform Proposals, *Nov. 26*, 660; *Dec. 1*, 1248–1250.
Lado Enclave, Position in, *Nov. 30*, 1104.
Old-Age Pensions
Poor Relief Disqualification, *Nov. 26*, 702; *Dec. 3*, 1706.
Regulations, Opportunity for Discussing, *Nov. 24*, 86.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, *Dec. 3*, 1706.
Public Accounts Committee Report, Time for Discussion of, *Nov. 26*, 700.
Queen Anne's Bounty, Scheme for Amalgamation with Ecclesiastical Commission, *Nov. 30*, 1103.
Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill—Date of taking, *Nov. 30*, 1105.
Treaties—Parliamentary Control over Ratification, *Nov. 26*, 701; *Dec. 1*, 1238.
York, Archbishop of—Ecclesiastical Views of Dr. Lang, *Dec. 3*, 1706.

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill
c. 2R.* *Dec. 1*, 1392.
Com., *Rep.* and 3R.* *Dec. 3*, 1756.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1316–1319.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 233–236.

Atkinson, Lord
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Rep.*, *Dec. 3*, 1594, 1596, 1597.
Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill, 2R., *Dec. 1*, 1230–1232.

Attorney-General—*Sir W. S. Robson.*

Attorney-General for Ireland—*Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.*

Austria-Hungary
Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 26*, 537.

Avebury, Lord
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Rep.*, *Dec. 3*, 1595.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1755.
Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 2*, 1515, 1523–1525.
Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Nov. 30*, 1070; *Dec. 2*, 1437.
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1222.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1720–1724.
White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill, *Con.*, *Dec. 3*, 1753.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [City of London]
  Business of the House, Course of, *Nov. 24*, 133; *Nov. 30*, 1106; *Dec. 3*, 1707.
  Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 520; *Nov. 26*, 707–723, 730; *Nov. 30*, 1109, 1110, 1114, 1123, 1132–1135, 1147–1150; *Dec. 1*, 1316.
    Allocation of Time to, *Nov. 26*, 703, 704; *Nov. 27*, 993–1002.
    Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1548, 1552.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
  Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to, *Dec. 2*, 1425.
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 828–842.
  Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill—Standing Order No. 93 Dispensed with, *Nov. 27*, 825.

Ballinaran
  Case of R. Foy.
    Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1097.

Ballingarry
  Land Purchased by Mr. H. D. Kenny.
    Qs. Mr. Hogan, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 131.

Ballyfarnon
  Cattle-drive on 11th inst.
    Qs. Sir F. Banbury, Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 26*, 697.

Ballymachugh
  Aughacreira and Moydristian Lands, Purchase of.
    Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1443.

Ballyogan
  Firing Outrage.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1697.

Ballyscullion
  Police Hut, Discontinuance of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1691.

Banbury, Sir F. [City of London]
  Ballyfarnon—Cattle-drive on 11th inst., *Nov. 26*, 697.
  Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill
    Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 1011.
    Withdrawal of, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 1475.
  Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1713–1715.
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1792, 1795, 1799, 1815, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1828.
  Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 226, 227, 230, 231, 232.

Bangor, Bishop
  Sunday Labour on Ships Lying in Port, *Nov. 30*, 1030.

Bank of England
  Notes not Presented for Forty Years System of Writing Off.
    Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 25*, 392.
    Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1078.

Baring, Mr. G. [Isle of Wight]
  Army—Strength of Infantry Battalions *Dec. 3*, 1654.
  Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Dec. 1*, 1246, 1247.

Barlow, Mr. P. [Bedford]
  Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1362.
  Petrol, Accidents from Explosion of, *Nov. 24*, 109.

Barnes, Mr. G. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
  Old-Age Pensions
    Investigation of Claims, Measures Allowed for, *Nov. 24*, 106.
    Regulations, Opportunity for Discussing, *Nov. 24*, 85.
  Poor Law—Scottish Out-Relief Payments, *Dec. 1*, 1266.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
  Agrarian Outrages (1906–8), *Nov 25*, 407.
  Newspapers warned as to Publication of Certain Resolutions, *Nov. 25*, 408.

Barrow River
  Drainage Proposals.
    Qs. Mr. P. Meehan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 405, 410.

Barrow-in-Furness
  Unemployment—Work of Distress Committee.
    Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 27*, 941.

Bawnboy
  Rural District Council—Case of T. Shannon.
    Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 4*, 1764.

Beach, Mr. M. H. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
  Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1718.
  White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill, *Con.*, *Dec. 3*, 1747, 1752, 1753.

Beale, Mr. W. P. [Ayrshire, S.]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 205.

Beauchamp, Earl—*Lord Steward*
Aliens Act, Administration of—Definition of "Immigrant Ship," etc., *Dec. 2*, 1415.
Children Bill, 3R., *Nov. 30*, 1035–1038, 1040–1043.
Incest Bill, 2R., *Dec. 2*, 1409.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 614–627.

Beck, Mr. A. C. [Cambridge, Wisbech]
Isle of Ely Small Holdings Committee, Report of, *Dec. 2*, 1430.

Begley Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1065.

Beinn Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1439.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Barrow-in-Furness Unemployed—Work of Distress Committee, *Nov. 27*, 941.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
Africa, South—Visit of Naval Squadron, *Nov. 25*, 389.
Cunard Line Subsidy—Agreement as to Freights, *Nov. 27*, 938.
Germany—Government Reservation of Essen Railway, *Nov. 24*, 101.
Merchant Shipping
  Rings and Conferences, Effect of and Proposals for Legislation, *Nov. 27*, 939.
  Subsidies, Conditions of Granting—Foreign Systems, *Nov. 27*, 937.
Navy
  "Barfleur"—Changes of Captain and Crew, *Dec. 1*, 1246; *Dec. 3*, 1652.
  Changing of Officers and Crews, System of, *Nov. 24*, 92.
  "Gladiator," Disposal of, *Dec. 1*, 1245
  Speed of Vessels, Proportionate Cost of Increasing, *Nov. 24*, 90.
  Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Date of Completing, *Nov. 25*, 388, 389.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
Cashel Disturbance on 23rd ult., *Dec. 1*, 1273.
Dove Petty Sessions—Case of Barber, *Dec. 1*, 1256.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 218.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1119–1121.
  Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 957.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R.—*cont.*
Holycross Disturbances—Arrest of Suspected Persons, *Dec. 3*, 1695.
Old-Age Pensions—Filial Contribution through Poor Law Guardians, *Nov. 30*, 1086.
Pentonville Road Remand Home—Case of Gertrude Andrews, *Dec. 1*, 1257.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 236–238, 246.

Belper, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 354; *Nov. 26*, 585–590.
Medical Inspection of Children—Grant to Local Authorities, etc., *Dec. 2*, 1397–1400, 1402, 1403.

Benn, Mr. W. W. [Tower Hamlets, St. George]
Education (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 2*, 1503–1505.

Bennett, Mr. E. N. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
Oxfordshire Small Holdings, Applications *Nov. 24*, 123.
Small Holdings
  Co-operation, Encouragement of, *Nov. 24*, 119.
  Delay, Proposals for Obviating, *Nov. 24*, 118.

Beri-Beri
Report on.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Sir H. Kearley, *Nov. 26*, 658.

Berkshire
Small Holdings Applications Rejected.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 123.

Bethell, Mr. T. R. [Essex, Maldon]
County Courts Procedure, Committee to Consider, proposed, *Dec. 13*, 1624.

Bills
House of Lords' Opinion—Ascertaining before taking Committee Stage in House of Commons, proposed.
Q. Mr. Henry; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 30*, 1104.

Birmingham, Bishop of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 579–585.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
Agrarian Outrages (1906–8), *Nov. 25*, 407, 408.
Agriculture, Departmental Funds devoted to, *Dec. 3*, 1702.
Ardess School—Case of Miss G. Knox, *Nov. 24*, 89.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Armagh
  - Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Case of J. Moore, *Nov. 25*, 409.
  - Land Purchase, Transactions to Date, *Nov. 30*, 1098.
- Ballinaraw—Case of R. Foy, *Nov. 30*, 1097.
- Ballingarry—Land Purchased by Mr. H. D. Kenny, *Nov. 24*, 131.
- Ballyfarnon—Cattle-drive on 11th inst., *Nov. 26*, 697.
- Ballymachugh Lands, Purchase of, *Dec. 2*, 1444.
- Ballyogan Firing Outrage, *Dec. 3*, 1697.
- Ballyscullion Police Hut, *Dec. 3*, 1691.
- Barrow River Drainage Proposals, *Nov. 25*, 405, 410.
- Bawnboy Rural District Council—Case of T. Shannon, *Dec. 4*, 1765.
- Begley Estate Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1065.
- Beinn Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2*, 1440.
- Blake Estate
  - Case of Forde, *Dec. 1*, 1238.
  - Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1065.
- Boxwell Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 26*, 689.
- Boycotting Statistics, *Nov. 25*, 375, 407.
- Branchfield Farm—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1097.
- Cahersivane Road to Clogvoola, Construction of, *Nov. 30*, 1096.
- Caldbeck Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 3*, 1689.
- Caploughlan Education Commissioners Estate, Sale of, *Nov. 30*, 1062.
- Carnacon—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1062.
- Carrick-on-Suir Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Arbitrators' Charges, *Dec. 4*, 1764.
- Cashel Disturbance on 23rd ult., *Dec. 1*, 1272, 1273.
- Castlerea—Seed Rate Uncollected in Union, *Nov. 25*, 383.
- Cattle-driving
  - Police Instructions for Dealing with, *Nov. 26*, 690.
  - Prison Treatment of Persons Unable to Furnish Sureties, *Nov. 30*, 1101.
- Cavan
  - Food and Drugs Act Analyses, *Dec. 1*, 1271.
  - Untenanted Lands of J. S. Winter and S. Saunderson—Date of Lodgment of Objections, *Nov. 24*, 128.
- Cavan and Leitrim Railway Administration—Inquiry proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1700.
- Chapman Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 1*, 1269.
- Charlemont Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 1*, 1267.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Clare
  - Condition of, *Nov. 26*, 692.
  - Labourers' Cottages Erected, *Nov. 26*, 691.
  - Land, Price of, *Nov. 26*, 689.
- Condition of Ireland—Report of Mr. Horne, *Dec. 2*, 1470.
- Constabulary
  - Cadetships—Nomination System, *Nov. 30*, 1066.
  - Extra Police Charges, Basis of Calculating, *Nov. 26*, 698; *Dec. 2*, 1443.
- Crosbie Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 3*, 1700.
- Crossgar Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Nov. 25*, 385.
- Curraheen—School Erection Proposals, *Nov. 24*, 129.
- Deering Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1061.
- Dick Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1061.
- Domville Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1065.
- Douglas Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1049.
- Dundrum Bay, Illegal Trawling in, *Dec. 3*, 1623, 1701.
- Dunleer Land, Disposal of, *Dec. 3*, 1685.
- Edenderry Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Dec. 3*, 1687.
- Education
  - Girls' Schools Closed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 1270.
  - Inspectorship — Appointment Projected, *Nov. 25*, 385.
  - Intermediate
    - Inspectorate, *Dec. 3*, 1695, 1696.
    - Rule 49, Interpretation of, *Nov. 24*, 126.
  - National School Teachers
    - Assistants, Salaries of, *Nov. 26*, 644; *Dec. 3*, 1645.
    - Grant, Distribution of, *Nov. 27*, 942.
    - Junior Assistants—Standard of Efficiency Required, *Nov. 30*, 1062.
    - Salaries
      - Delay in Paying, *Dec. 2*, 1438.
      - Procedure in Dealing with Claims, *Nov. 30*, 1064.
- Ely Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 1*, 1274.
- Ennis Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 24*, 130.
- Evictions
  - Dooley, R., Case of, *Dec. 1*, 1275.
  - Drum, P., Case of, *Nov. 24*, 90.
- Fairs and Markets
  - Regulation of, *Dec. 2*, 1471.
  - Whisky Sold at Fairs, *Dec. 4*, 1763.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Fermanagh
  - Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 27*, 942.
  - Vaughan's Charitable School, Administration of, *Nov. 30*, 1050.
- Firearms
  - Outrages in which Used, *Nov. 25*, 406.
  - Regulation of Traffic, *Dec. 3*, 1697.
- Fleetwood Rynd and others, Estate of—Sale Proposals, *Dec. 1*, 1244.
- Floods, Prevention of, *Dec. 2*, 1435.
- Food and Drugs Act—Administration in Ireland, *Nov. 26*, 646.
- Franks Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 26*, 698, 699.
- Fuge Estate, Purchase of, *Dec. 3*, 1687.
- Galway
  - Constabulary Inspectors and Head Constables, *Nov. 25*, 386.
  - County Inspectors' Salaries, *Dec. 2*, 1443.
  - Extra Police Employed, *Nov. 26*, 698; *Nov. 30*, 1047.
  - Lewis, Mr., Police Protection of, *Nov. 30*, 1051.
- Gore-Booth Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2*, 1442.
- Gortdromerillagh—Moonlighting Outrage on 19th inst., *Nov. 26*, 693.
- Grehan Estate, Case of T. Barrett, *Dec. 3*, 1644.
- Gurteen
  - Case of M. Finnerty, *Dec. 3*, 1703.
  - Police Patrol, Attack on, *Dec. 3*, 1698.
- Harlech Estate
  - Bog Land, Disposal of, *Dec. 1*, 1243.
  - Market House, Use for, *Dec. 1*, 1242.
- Holycross—Arrest of Persons Concerned in Disturbance, *Nov. 26*, 647, 692; *Dec. 3*, 1695.
- Home and Cottage Industries, Definition of, *Nov. 24*, 131.
- Irish Land Bill
  - Bonus, Effect on Payment of, *Nov. 26*, 655.
  - Clause 44, Effect of, *Dec. 2*, 1472.
  - Proposals as to, *Nov. 26*, 696.
- Irish Language, Cost of Teaching in Schools, *Nov. 26*, 688.
- Irish Universities Bill—Issue of Charters, *Nov. 26*, 644.
- Joly Estate—Case of Mrs. Killen and Mrs. Hobson, *Nov. 25*, 384.
- Jordan Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1064.
- Kenmare Estate
  - Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 26*, 643.
  - Sale Proposals, *Nov. 25*, 412.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Kilbeggan Cattle-Driving Prosecution, *Nov. 26*, 696.
- Kildorrery—Case of J. McGrath, *Nov. 26*, 696.
- Kilfinane Rent Recovery Proceedings, *Dec. 1*, 1274.
- Killarney Fair Rent Appeals, Decisions in, *Nov. 26*, 699.
- Kilmurry—Case of Mr. R. J. Walsh, *Nov. 30*, 1052.
- Kilrecle—Land Unsold and Condition of District, *Nov. 30*, 1100.
- Kilrush Incendiary Fires on 20th inst., *Nov. 26*, 646.
- King-Harman Estate
  - Vallinamuck Portion, Agreements for, *Nov. 26*, 699.
  - Turbary Rights, *Nov. 30*, 1095, 1098.
- Knockaderry—Case of Mrs. Browne, Dec. *3*, 1647.
- Knockmay—Police Investigation of Burning of Straw, *Nov. 25*, 409; *Dec. 3*, 1692, 1693.
- Knox Estate—Case of P. Kilroy, *Nov. 30*, 1097.
- Land Act, 1903, Section 3, Land Purchased under, *Nov. 25*, 381.
- Land Law Act, 1896—Rents of Joint Holdings, *Dec. 2*, 1442.
- Land Purchase
  - Amount Required, *Nov. 27*, 942.
  - Bonus—Effect of Projected Legislation, *Nov. 30*, 1052.
  - Estate, Procedure in Declaring, *Dec. 3*, 1699.
  - Middleman's Lease, Redemption of, *Dec. 3*, 1621.
  - Mortgage of Holding and Subsequent Eviction, Cases of, *Dec. 1*, 1268.
  - Price, Basis of Calculating, *Nov. 25*, 386.
  - Priority of Cases, *Nov. 26*, 694.
  - Re-sale—Interest Payable, etc., *Nov. 30*, 1051.
  - Residents in and out of Ireland, Payments to, *Nov. 24*, 127.
  - Sporting Rights, Exercise of, *Dec. 3*, 1689.
  - Turbary Rights, *Nov. 30*, 1050.
- Land Purchase Act, 1891—Rules made under Section 2, *Nov. 25*, 382.
- Lane - Joynt Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 27*, 935.
- Langley Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Dec. 3*, 1646.
- Lansdowne Estate—Case of Mr. D. Whelan, *Nov. 25*, 405.
- Leigh Estate—Case of E. Egan, *Dec. 1*, 1274.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Limerick
  - Labourers' Cottages Schemes, *Dec. 1,* 1269.
  - Mount St. Vincent Orphanage, Management of, *Nov. 26,* 693, 649.
  - Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 26,* 696.
- Liquor Traffic—Irish Reform Proposals, *Nov. 25,* 382.
- Lloyd Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 26,* 691.
- Local Government Board
  - Auditors, Appointment of, *Dec. 3,* 1691.
  - Surcharge System, *Dec. 4,* 1765.
- Lyons Estate—Case of Mrs. B. O'Connell, *Nov. 27,* 936.
- McCausland Estate—Case of Mrs. M. Rice, *Dec. 3,* 1623.
- Macroom Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Cases of Sheehan, Cottar, and Twohig, *Nov. 25,* 414.
- Magistrates—Threatening Letters received in Ireland, *Nov. 26,* 687.
- Marsham Estate—Case of Mrs. A. McHugh, *Dec. 2,* 1473.
- Martyn Estate, Purchase and Disposal of, *Nov. 24,* 128.
- Massey Estate Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *Nov. 27,* 936.
- Mearscourt Estate—Case of Mrs. Wynn and Mrs. Winkel, *Dec. 3,* 1686.
- Milltown—Disposal of Mr. Fetherston's Ranch, *Nov. 24,* 127.
- Montgomery Estate—Case of M. Sweeny, *Nov. 30,* 1060.
- Morrogh Bernard Estate—Case of M. Buckley, *Nov. 25,* 411.
- Mountjoy Prison—Case of R. O'Brien, *Nov. 26,* 645.
- Mullingar District Lunatic Asylum Accounts, *Nov. 26,* 641.
- Munster Land Purchase Prices, *Dec. 3,* 1693, 1694.
- Newspapers Warned as to Publication of certain Resolutions, *Nov. 25,* 408; *Dec. 3,* 1690.
- O'Connor Estate
  - Case of Mrs. McCabe, *Nov. 24,* 88.
  - Rents on, *Nov. 30,* 1061.
- Old-Age Pensions, Irish Claims for—Estimate of Persons over Seventy, *Dec. 3,* 1633, 1634.
- Ormathwaite Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Dec. 3,* 1699.
- Outrages—Cause for Failure to Report to Police, *Nov. 26,* 691.
- Pakenham Estate Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *Nov. 24,* 127, 128.
- Persons under Police Protection, *Nov. 25,* 407.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Poor Law
  - Deportation of Paupers, System of, *Nov. 30,* 1102.
  - Reform Proposals, *Dec. 3,* 1690.
  - Returns, Cost of Furnishing, *Nov. 30,* 1101.
- Portumna—Re-building of Shannon Bridge, *Nov. 30,* 1099.
- Potts Estate, Situation on, *Nov. 25,* 384.
- Poyntzpass Sewerage, Inquiry into, *Dec. 1,* 1267.
- Railways—Report on State Purchase, *Nov. 26,* 686; *Dec. 3,* 1686.
- Rathdowney Petty Sessions—Case of P. Sweeny, *Nov. 30,* 1063.
- Riverstown
  - Boycotting Cases, *Nov. 26,* 690.
  - Disturbance on 29th ult.—Inquiry into Death of J. Stenson, *Nov. 26,* 685.
  - United Irish League Intimidation Prosecution, *Nov. 26,* 688.
- Robe River, Drainage of, *Nov. 30,* 1065.
- Roscommon—Case of T. Conboy, *Dec. 1,* 1270.
- Rosse Estate—Case of R. Egan, *Dec. 2,* 1472.
- Saurin Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2,* 1471.
- Shelton Estate, Disposal of, *Nov. 27,* 935.
- Sigginshaggard Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 30,* 1049.
- Sligo Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Dec. 2,* 1440.
- Toome—Prosecutions for Illicit Distilling, *Dec. 3,* 1691.
- Tottenham Estate—Case of F. McGuinness, *Dec. 1,* 1243.
- Towerhill Cattle-drive on 7th inst., *Nov. 26,* 684.
- Trade Frauds, Prevention of, *Dec. 3,* 1702.
- Trench Estate—Advance made to Mr. Carroll, *Nov. 24,* 130.
- Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 30,* 1096.
- Unemployment—Applications for Grants and Amount Allotted, *Nov. 24,* 129, 130.
- United Irish League, Activity in 1907, *Nov. 26,* 686, 687.
- Verschoyle Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2,* 1441.
- Waller Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 27,* 937.
- Waterville Salmon Hatchery, *Dec. 3,* 1688.
- West Estate—Case of P. D. Kelly, *Nov. 30,* 1094.
- Westmeath
  - Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Dec. 2,* 1439.
  - Police, Information as to, *Nov. 26,* 695.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
White Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 3*, 1646.
Whyte Blake Estate—Sale Proposals, etc., *Nov. 30*, 1100.
Workhouse Teachers, Salaries of, *Dec. 3*, 1690, 1698.
Wynne Estate—Sale of Hazlewood, *Dec. 2*, 1441.

Birstall
John Bass Charity, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Walker; *As.* Mr. Soares, *Dec. 1*, 1239.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Bedfordshire, Biggleswade]
Old-Age Pensions—Wife of Man receiving Poor Relief, *Dec. 1*, 1258.

Blake Estate
Case of Forde.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1237.
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1065.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]
Cahersivane Road to Clogvoola, Construction of, *Nov. 30*, 1095.
Coastguard Stations, Reduction of, *Nov. 25*, 414.
Curraheen School Erection Proposals, *Nov. 24*, 129.
Education—Intermediate Rule 49, Interpretation of, *Nov. 24*, 126.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*. 149–150, 155, 161, 205, 215.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 781–783.
Foreign Systems, Information as to, *Nov. 26*, 664.
Fairs and Markets, Regulation of, *Dec. 2*, 1471.
Waterville Salmon Hatchery, *Dec. 3*, 1688.

Boulton, Mr. A. C. F. [Huntingdonshire, Ramsey]
Ramsey—Sanitary Condition, *Nov. 26*, 639.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, N.]
Business of the House, Course of, *Dec. 3*, 1709.
Copyright Convention—Effect on Purchased but unpublished Works, *Dec. 2*, 1436
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1359.
International Naval Conference
Parliamentary Consent to Conclusions, *Nov. 24*, 102, 103.
Powers Invited to take Part in, *Nov.24*, 103.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1785, 1791, 1812.
Terminable Annuities — Readjustment System, *Nov. 25*, 393.

Boxwell Estate
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Qs. Mr. Ffrench; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 689.

Bramsdon, Mr. T. A. [Portsmouth]
Navy
Engineer Officers, *Status* of, *Dec. 1*, 1244, 1245.
Portsmouth Dock—Wages Paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason, *Nov. 30*, 1066.

Branchfield Farm
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1096.

Brassey, Lord
Navy
Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 24*, 60, 61.
Two-Power Standard, Maintenance of, *Nov. 24*, 60, 61.

Brentford
Unemployment—Application for Distress Committee.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1632.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec*, *1*, 1370, 1371.

Bristol, Bishop of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 367–370.

British Indians in the Colonies
Transvaal, Position in.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 25*, 391.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 3*, 1666.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees, Mr. Lupton, Mr. Scott; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 3*, 1667.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 3*, 1668.
Ghandi, Mr., Case of.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Cox, Mr. Byles, Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 30*, 1072.

Brooke, Mr. G. S. [Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley.]
Hackney Marshes, Work for Unemployed on, *Nov. 30*, 1056.
Poplar Unemployed, Work for, *Nov. 30*, 1056.

Bryce, Mr. J. A. [Inverness Burghs]
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1726–1729.

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Perthshire, E.]
- Administrative Reform Proposals, *Nov. 24*, 95.
- Anarchist Outrages, Proposals for Dealing with, *Dec. 3*, 1663.
- Army
  - Change of Stations, Method of effecting, *Nov. 24*, 82.
  - Charges—Objections to proposed Arrangement, *Dec. 3*, 1647, 1664.
  - Pay, Increase in, *Dec. 3*, 1664.
- Calcutta—House Accommodation for Government Officials, *Dec. 1*, 1252.
- Clough, Mr., Murder of, *Dec. 1*, 1250.
- Coconada—Cost of Extra Police, *Nov. 26*, 662.
- Dacca Student, Cause for Murder of, *Nov. 24*, 93.
- Education Policy, *Nov. 26*, 661.
- Hume, Mr., Attempt to Assassinate, *Dec. 1*, 1250.
- Jhansi—Sentence on Brahmin for Tampering with Troops, *Dec. 3*, 1663.
- Labour Agencies, Government Assistance to, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 661.
- Malarial Fever, Prevalence of, *Dec. 1*, 1251.
- Marine Department—Grievances of Clerks, *Nov. 24*, 94.
- Mysore—Position of Converts from Hinduism, *Nov. 30*, 1060.
- Seditious Literature sent through French Colonies, *Dec. 1*, 1251.
- Simla—Boundary of Penrose Estate, *Nov. 25*, 381.
- Telegrams (1903–7), *Dec. 2*, 1440.
- United Provinces, Famine in, *Dec. 1*, 1253.

Bulgaria
- Treaty with, Accession of British Colonies, Presented, *Dec. 1*, 1235; *Dec. 3*, 1393.

Bull, Sir W. J. [Hammersmith]
- Cattle-driving—Prison Treatment of Persons unable to find Sureties, *Nov. 30*, 1100.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill—Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 1013.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1822.
- Women's Suffrage Movement, Prison Treatment, *Nov. 30*, 1079.

Burghclere, Lord
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 844–848.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
- Barrow-in-Furness Unemployment—Work of Distress Committee, *Nov. 27*, 941.
- Brentford Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1632.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Chelsea Unemployment Schemes submitted, *Nov. 25*, 378.
- Chiswick Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1631.
- Cockermouth Unemployed Persons, Disfranchisement of, *Nov. 24*, 114.
- Farm Labourers, Migratory, Accommodation provided for, *Dec. 1*, 1240.
- Fever Hospitals, Inspection of, *Dec. 2*, 1460.
- Folkestone Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1633.
- Grays Thurrock Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1630.
- Hackney Marshes, Work for Unemployed on, *Nov. 30*, 1056.
- Hampstead Borough Council Robing-Room, *Dec. 3*, 1651.
- Harrogate Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1632.
- King's Lynn—Disposal of Snettisham Farm, *Dec. 1*, 1260.
- Lancashire Technical Schools, Delay in Building, *Nov. 24*, 114.
- Liverpool Unemployment—Funds of Distress Committee, *Nov. 30*, 1088.
- Local Authorities Loans—Applications under Consideration, *Nov. 30*, 1088.
- Loughborough Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1631.
- Maryport Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 24*, 114.
- Mitcham Common Improvements, Grant for, *Dec. 1*, 1259.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Filial Contribution through Poor Law Guardians, *Nov. 30*, 1086, 1087; *Dec. 1*, 1242.
  - Husband of Woman in Receipt of Poor Relief, *Dec. 4*, 1762.
  - Law Officers' Opinions, Date of Receiving, *Dec. 3*, 1630.
  - Poor Relief Disqualification—Interpretation of Certain Cases, *Nov. 25*, 379; *Nov. 26*, 647; *Dec. 3*, 1651.
  - Wages—Allocation between Husband and Wife, *Dec. 2*, 1458, 1459.
  - Wife of Person in Receipt of Poor Relief, *Nov. 24*, 113; *Dec. 1*, 1258, 1259; *Dec. 3*, 1649.
- Pentonville Road Remand Home
  - Case of Gertrude Andrews, *Dec. 1*, 1257.
  - Cutting of Girl's Hair, *Nov. 24*, 115, 116.
- Poplar Unemployed, Work for, *Nov. 30*, 1056.
- Preston Mission Shelter—Case of W. Walsh, *Nov. 26*, 640.
- Ramsey—Sanitary Condition, *Nov. 26*, 640.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Southwick-on-Wear, Distress in, *Nov. 24*, 87; *Dec. 1*, 1241.
Stoke-on-Trent
  Distress Committee, Sanction to, *Nov. 24*, 83; *Dec. 3*, 1632.
  Fenton Electric Supply, Loan for, *Nov. 24*, 83.
Tuberculosis Notification—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1087.
Unemployed Workmen Act—Returns under Section 2 (3), *Nov. 24*, 116, 117.
Unemployment
  Disfranchisement Regulations, *Dec. 2*, 1459, 1460.
  Metropolitan Borough Employment Statistics, *Nov. 25*, 378.
Wavertree—Premises used in Paying Poor Law Relief, *Dec. 3*, 1630.
Wimbledon Unemployment Grant, *Dec. 3*, 1631.
Workington Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 24*, 114.

Burwell.
Crown Farm, Leasing of.
  Qs. Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Nicholls; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 84.

Business of the House.
Course of.
  Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 24*, 133; *Nov. 30*, 1106; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. L. Hardy, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Vivian, *Dec. 3*, 1707; Mr. J. A. Pease, Sir A. Acland-Hood, *Dec. 3*, 1756.
Measures to be Passed, etc.
  Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Dec. 1*, 1230; *Dec. 2*, 1418–1422; Earl of Crewe, 1422, 1423; Lord Newton, 1423–1425.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 755–760; *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1194–1197.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Basket Contracts, Placing of, *Dec. 1*, 1260.
Canadian Magazine Post, Success of, *Dec. 3*, 1676.
Chelsea King's Road Post Office, Hours of Business at, *Nov. 26*, 641.
Christmas Work, Pay for, *Nov. 25*, 372; *Dec. 3*, 1677.
Gloucestershire Telegraph Facilities, *Dec. 3*, 1677.
Hobhouse Report, Result of Classification under, *Nov. 25*, 374.
Killea Sub-Post Office, Position of, *Nov. 30*, 1103.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
Kilmessan and Robinstown Postal Service, *Dec. 3*, 1705.
Newspaper Rates to and from Australia, *Dec. 2*, 1437.
North Ronaldshay, Telegraph Extension to, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1089.
Portumna Postal Facilities, *Nov. 30*, 1103.
Postmasters — Licensed Publicans Appointed in Ireland, *Nov. 25*, 398.
Postmen, Auxiliary, in City, Pay of, *Dec. 1*, 1260.
Servia—Parcel Post Arrangements, *Dec. 3*, 1653.
Stretton Sugwas Sub-Postmaster, Prosecution of, *Nov. 25*, 397.
Telegraph Service
  Betting Telegrams, Transmission of, *Nov. 25*, 397.
  Messengers—Conditions of Placing on the Establishment, *Nov. 30*, 1089.
  Races, Staff Employed at, *Nov. 26*, 657.
Tullaroan—Postal Facilities at Gaulstown, *Dec. 3*, 1704.
Walsall Post Office Clerk Prosecuted for Betting, *Dec. 2*, 1461.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]
British Indians in the Transvaal—Case of Mr. Ghandi, *Nov. 30*, 1073.
Coroners Inquests, Press Representation at, *Nov. 30*, 1080; *Dec. 3*, 1625.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 737.
  Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 992, 993, 1001.

Cabs
Taximeter—Privileges at Railway Stations.
  Q. Mr. Renton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 642.

Cahersivane
Road to Clogvoola, Construction of.
  Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1095.

Caldbeck Estate
Sale Proposals.
  Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1688.

Camperdown, Earl of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 626–633.

Canada
[*See also Names of States.*]
Immigration Laws.
  Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 30*, 1072.

Canadian Pacific Railway Company
Glasgow Boiler-makers, Treatment of.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 2*, 1452.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 538–550, 552.

Caploughlan
Education Commissioners' Estate, Sale of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1062.

Carlile Mr. E. H. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24*, 147.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 1*, 1369, 1375.
Estate Duty Office—Salaries and Promotion of Clerks, *Nov. 30*, 1092.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con., Nov. 24*, 229.

Carlisle, Earl of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 364–367.

Carnacon
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1062.

Carpets
Foreign Prison-made, Importation of.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 30*, 1084.

Carr-Gomm, Mr. H. W. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
Mall, Erection of Arches in, *Dec. 2*, 1467.

Carrick-on-Suir
Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Arbitrators' Charges.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 4*, 1763.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture.*
Cattle Importation Restrictions, *Nov. 24*, 24.
Foot and Mouth Disease—American Outbreaks, *Nov. 24*, 24.
Small Holdings
Loans to Local Authorities, Terms of, *Dec. 3*, 1615–1619.
Valuation—Appeal in Cases of Difference as to, *Dec. 3*, 1620.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]
Education (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 2*, 1521.

"Cartsdyke"
Crew of.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1622.

Cashel
Disturbances.
Qs. Mr. Condon; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 26*, 702.
Qs. Mr. Condon, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Belloc; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1271.

Castlerea
Seed Rate Uncollected in Union.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 382.

Castlereagh, Lord [Maidstone]
Irish Land Bill—Interpretation of Clauses 3 (2) and (3), *Nov. 30*, 1047.

Cattle
Breeding—Funds Available for Improvement.
Qs. Mr. E. Davies, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Fuller, *Dec. 3*, 1681.
Import Statistics and Regulations.
Qs. Mr. Cooper, Mr. Watt; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 1*, 1262.
Importation Restrictions.
Os. Earl of Onslow, *Nov. 24*, 23; Earl Carrington, 24.

Cavan
Food and Drugs Act, Analyses under.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1271.
Untenanted Lands of J. S. Winter and S. Saunderson—Date of Lodgment of Objections.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 128.

Cavan and Leitrim Railway
Administration—Inquiry proposed.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1700.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 1*, 1379–1381, 1384, 1386.
Licensing Act, 1904—Loans, Period for Repayment, *Dec. 3*, 1624.
Taxes—Appointment of Assistant Surveyors, *Dec. 3*, 1652.

Cawdor, Earl
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 908–919.
Navy
Battleships, Cost of, *Nov. 24*, 29.
Docking Accommodation for Vessels of "Dreadnought" Class, *Nov. 24*, 32.
Guns and Gun-Mountings, Provision of, *Nov. 24*, 29.
Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 24*, 25, 28–31.

[*cont.*

Cawdor, Earl—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Stores, Reserve of, *Nov. 24*, 32.
Torpedo Boat Destroyers—Construction Policy, *Nov. 24*, 31, 35.
Two-Power Standard, Definition and Maintenance of, *Nov. 24*, 25–30, 32, 54.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
Educational Expenditure by Local Authorities, Statement as to, *Nov. 25*, 402.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 476–483; *Nov. 30*, 1121–1125, 1140; *Dec. 1*, 1287, 1288, 1298–1300, 1336–1338, 1343–1346, 1367, 1369, 1386, 1388, 1389; *Dec. 2*, 1481, 1507–1509, 1517.
Allocation of Time to, *Nov. 25*, 415, 416; *Nov. 26*, 704; *Nov. 27*, 947, 989–992, 1012, 1014.
Clause 2 (5), Tabling of Regulations made under, *Nov. 24*, 85.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1574.
Negotiations, Result of, *Nov. 30*, 1105.
Old-Age Pensions—Case of Wife of Man Receiving Poor Relief, *Dec. 1*, 1259.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1770, 1772–1776, 1782, 1787, 1789, 1807, 1820.
Swansea Education Dispute, *Nov. 25*, 402.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1351.
Clause 1 (2) (*a*), Interpretation of, *Nov. 26*, 678.

Census of Production
Agriculture Returns, Cost and Difficulty of Obtaining.
Q. Mr. Rendall; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1636.
Rules Presented, *Nov. 26*, 537, 638; *Nov. 27*, 827; *Dec. 4*, 1758.

"Cereda"
Crew of.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1455.

Ceylon
Tea Cess, Reason for Ceasing to Collect.
Q. Mr. Heaton; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 4*, 1761.

Chairman & Deputy-Chairman—Rulings
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill.
Amendment to insert Words at Commencement of Clause was not in Order, *Nov. 30*, 1106, 1107.

Chairman & Deputy-Chairman—Rulings—*cont.*
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill—*cont.*
Arguing about something already disposed of was not in Order, *Dec. 1*, 1336, 1338, 1364, 1365.
General Discussion of a Clause on Proposal to omit Subsection (1) would not be in Order, *Dec. 1*, 1291, 1295, 1297.
Irrelevant Matter, *Nov. 30*, 1119, 1123, 1124, 1127, 1128, 1184; *Dec. 1*, 1291, 1293, 1294, 1297, 1318, 1354, 1366, 1370; *Dec. 2*, 1523.
Port of London Bill.
Discussion of Details on New Clause, *Dec. 4*, 1784, 1795, 1798, 1799, 1824.
Report Stage—Introduction of New Clause, *Dec. 4*, 1843.
Withdrawal of Amendment to move in a new Form, *Dec. 4*, 1830.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. A. J. [Worcestershire, E.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1128–1132, 1204; *Dec.* 1, 1279–1285, 1289, 1362, 1382.; *Dec. 2*, 1482–1485, 1503, 1516, 1528.
Allocation of Time to, *Nov. 25*, 415; *Nov. 27*, 958–963.
Roman Catholic School Grant, Effect on, *Nov. 30*, 1090.
Fiscal Policy of International Trade, Circumstances of Preparation of, *Nov. 24*, 105.
Ingatestone Election Disturbance, *Nov. 30*, 1081.
Old-Age Pensions, Filial Contribution through Poor Law Guardians, *Nov. 30*, 1086.
Railways—Annual Contributions to Exchequer and Local Rates, *Nov. 30*, 1058.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Rt. Hon. Viscount Fowler.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

Channing, Sir F. A. [Northants, E.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1305–1309.

Chapman Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1268.

Charitable Institutions
Schemes for Regulation of Hours, Intervals, and Holidays, Presented, *Nov. 30*, 1022, 1045.

Charities
Weir Charity Scheme.
Qs. Sir H. Kimber; *As.* Mr. Soares, *Dec. 2*, 1468.

Charlemont Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1267.

Chatham
Docking Accommodation at.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Nov. 24*, 66, 67.

Chelsea
Kings Road Post Office, Hours of Business at.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 26*, 641.
Unemployment Schemes submitted.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 25*, 378.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Children
Employment of—Enforcement of Section 3 (4) and (5) of Act of 1903.
Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 25*, 394.
Juvenile Offenders, *see that title.*

Children Bill
l. 3R., *Nov. 30*, 1035.

China
Ichang and Neighbourhood—Report Presented, *Nov. 25*, 280.

Chiswick
Unemployment—Application for Distress Committee.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1631.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. S.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Dundee].
Aberdeen—Railway Carriage of Fish, *Dec. 2*, 1453, 1454.
All-British Mail Route, Progress of Negotiations, *Nov. 30*, 1084.
Arbitration Board, Formation of, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1054.
Annalong Harbour Lamps, Responsibility for Lighting, *Nov. 25*, 380.
"Ashburton," Crew of, *Dec. 2*, 1457.
Carpets, Foreign Prison-made, Importation of, *Nov. 30*, 1084.
"Cartsdyke," Crew of, *Dec. 3*, 1622.
"Cereda," Crew of, *Dec. 2*, 1457.
Coastguard, Irish Stations, Reduction of, *Nov. 25*, 414.
Colwyn Bay Pier, Decision as to, *Dec. 1*, 1237.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. S.—*cont.*
Companies Consolidation Bill, 2R, *Dec. 3*, 1755.
Copyright of Purchased but Unpublished Works, Effect of Convention on, *Dec. 2*, 1436.
Cunard Line Subsidy Agreement as to Freights, *Nov. 27*, 938.
Electric Lighting Accounts—Appointment of Auditors, *Nov. 24*, 113.
Fiscal Relations between Foreign Countries and their Colonies, *Dec. 3*, 1675.
Hammersmith Bridge, Protection of Embankment near, *Nov. 24*, 112.
Insurance—Circular as to Illegal Policies, *Dec. 3*, 1673, 1674.
Lights and Lighthouses—Sites acquired since 1899, *Dec. 2*, 1432.
Liverpool, Port of—Demurrage caused by Shallow Waterways, *Dec. 3*, 1674.
"Lord Derby," Crew of, *Dec. 2*, 1457.
Lostock Gralam Railway Level Crossing Accident, *Nov. 25*, 394.
Meat Trade Combination — Work of Committee, *Dec. 1*, 1257.
Merchant Shipping
 Deck Hands — Advisory Committee Recommendations, *Dec. 2*, 1457.
 Mates—Board of Trade Examination Fees, *Nov. 24*, 87.
 Rings and Conferences, Effect of and Proposals for Legislation, *Nov. 27*, 939.
 Seamen's Boarding-Houses, Control over, *Dec. 2*, 1454.
 Subsidies, Conditions of Granting—Foreign Systems, *Nov. 27*, 938.
Orkney — North Ronaldshay, Telegraph Extension to, *Dec. 3*, 1675.
Port of London—Demurrage through Shallowness of River, *Dec. 3*, 1672.
Port of London Bill, Recom., *Dec. 4*, 1767–1772, 1778, 1794, 1798, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1806, 1809, 1811, 1817, 1822, 1824, 1827, 1829, 1830, 1832, 1835, 1837, 1838, 1840, 1842.
Ports, Use of and Schemes for improving (United Kingdom and Foreign Countries), *Dec. 3*, 1672.
Railways
 Contributions by Companies to certain Associations, *Dec. 3*, 1673.
 Coupling Accidents *Dec. 3*, 1650.
 Ireland
  Lodging-houses provided for Guards, etc., State of, *Nov. 30*, 1055.
  Midland Great Western—Hours of Duty of Firemen, etc., *Nov. 30*, 1054.
  Midland Company Goods Guards, Hours of Duty of, *Nov. 24*, 110, 111.
  North British Employees, Civil Rights of, *Nov. 30*, 1084-1086.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Rhue Rhea, Lighthouse and Fog-Signal for, *Dec. 1*, 1237.
- Salt—Colonial and Foreign Import Duties, *Dec. 2*, 1429.
- Salvation Army, Registration of, *Nov. 27*, 939.
- Slates—Import Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 111.
- "Spartan Prince"—Inquiry into Loss, *Dec. 3*, 1622.
- "Strombus"—Deaths of Asiatics, *Dec. 2*, 1457.
- Unemployment, Insurance against—German System, *Dec. 2*, 1457.
- United States Copyright Regulations, *Nov. 25*, 396, 397.
- Welsh Trade Statistics, Publication of, *Nov. 24*, 113.

Civil Service
- Boy Clerkships, Examinations for.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 26*, 679.
- Pensions
  - Counting of Unestablished Service.
    - *Q.* Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1077.
  - New Scheme for.
    - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1058.
- Second Division Clerks
  - Examinations for.
    - *Q.* Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 30*, 1056.
  - Salaries.
    - *Qs.* Mr. S. Collins; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 30*, 1091.
    - *Qs.* Earl of Ronaldshay; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 1*, 1265.
- Superannuation, *see that title.*

Clare
- Condition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 692.
- Labourers' Cottages erected.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 691.
- Land, Price of.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 689.

Clifford of Chudleigh, Lord
- Medical Inspection of School Children—Grant to Local Authorities, etc., *Dec. 2*, 1405.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton]
- Grindleton Churchyard Extension Proposals, *Nov. 25*, 373.

Clyde
- Foreshores above Greenock, Valuation of,
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 25*, 375.

Clynes, Mr. J. R. [Manchester, N.E.]
- Hammersmith Bridge, Protection of Embankment near, *Nov. 24*, 112.
- Loughborough Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1631.
- Midland Railway Company Goods Guards, Hours of Duty of, *Nov. 24*, 110.
- Wimbledon Unemployment Grant, *Dec. 3*, 1631.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill
- Proposals as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Glover; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 26*, 700.
  - *Q.* Mr. Glover; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 3*, 1707.

Coastguard
- Committee Report, Proposals as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. W. F. D. Smith, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Earl Winterton; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 2*, 1446.
- Irish Stations, Reduction of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 25*, 414.
- Legislative Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 24*, 117.

Coates
- Small Holdings Applications.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nicholls; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 2*, 1469.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N.]
- Civil Service Second Division Clerkships, Examinations for, *Nov. 30*, 1056.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 148, 149, 158, 164–166, 182, 183, 185, 190–193, 195, 196, 199, 210.
- North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1220–1222.
- Public Meetings in Scotland, Supply of Lantern Slides, *Nov. 24*, 126.

Cockermouth
- Unemployed Persons, Disfranchisement of.
  - *Q.* Sir J. Randles; *A.* Mr. Burns *Nov. 24*, 113.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, Bordesley]
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill—Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 976–981.
- Fiscal Policy of International Trade, Publication of, *Dec. 3*, 1633.
- Small Holdings—Land held by Co-operative Societies, *Dec. 3*, 1678.

Collins, Mr. S. [Lambeth, Kennington]
- Civil Service Second Division Clerks, Salaries, *Nov. 30*, 1091.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1340, 1359.
Hop Industry—Select Committee Recommendations, *Dec. 1*, 1241.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 238–243, 251.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.
Under-Secretary—Colonel Seely.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*For Particular Colonies, etc., see their Names.*]
Immigration Laws.
Qs. Mr. Essex, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 24*, 95.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 30*, 1073.
Q. Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 3*, 1666.
Statistical Abstract Presented, *Dec. 1*, 1229, 1234.

Colwyn Bay
Pier, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. McArthur; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 1*, 1236.

Commercial Firms
Registration of—Reports on Colonial and Foreign Systems Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1758.

Companies Consolidation Bill
c. 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1755.

Conditional Licences
See under Penal Servitude Acts.

Condon Mr. T. J. [Tipperary, E.]
Cashel Disturbances, *Nov. 26*, 702; *Dec. 1*, 1271.

Congo Free State
British Vice-Consuls and Travelling Facilities.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 1*, 1253.
Lado Enclave, *see* Soudan.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*See also Names of Places.*]
Cadetships—Nomination System.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1066.
Cattle-driving Cases, *see under* Ireland.
Extra Police Charges, Basis of Calculating.
Qs. Mr. Hazleton; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 697; *Dec. 2*, 1443.

Consumption
See Tuberculosis

Cooper, Mr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Anæsthetics, Administration of—Case of A. Lebathe, *Nov. 26*, 655.
Beri-Beri, Report on, *Nov. 26*, 658.
Cattle Import Statistics, etc., *Dec. 1*, 1262.
Foot-and-Mouth Disease, American Outbreak, *Dec. 1*, 1262.
Foreign Office Women Clerks, *Dec. 2*, 1435.
Hampstead Borough Council Robing-room, *Dec. 3*, 1650.
Home Office—Women Clerks and Inspectors Employed, *Dec. 3*, 1621.
Telegraph Staff employed at Races, *Nov. 26*, 657.

Copyright
American Regulations, *see* United States.
Purchased but Unpublished Works, Effect of Convention on.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1436.

Corbett, Mr. C. H. [Sussex, East Grinstead]
Old-Age Pensions—Regulations as to Compulsory Filial Payments through Poor Law Guardians, *Dec. 1*, 1242.

Cornwall, Duchy of
Lord Warden—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Cornwall, Sir E. A. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1776, 1777.

Coroner's Inquests
Press Representation at—St. Giles Case.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 25*, 394.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 30*, 1079.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 3*, 1625.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
India
Administrative Reform Proposals, *Nov. 24*, 94, 95.
Dacca Student, Cause for Murder of, *Nov. 24*, 93.

County Courts
Procedure, Committee to consider, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. R. Bethell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 3*, 1624.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
Army
Territorial Force
Musketry Training, *Dec. 2*, 1640, 1643, 1644.
Re-engagement, *Dec. 3*, 1640.

[*cont.*

Courthope, Mr. G. L.—*cont.*
- Fiscal Policy and International Trade, Revision before Publication, *Nov. 26*, 650.
- Fruit Trees, Leaflet as to Spraying, *Dec. 3*, 1681, 1682.
- Gooseberry Mildew—Course of Disease in Winter, *Dec. 3*, 1680.
- Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 2*; 1725.
- Tobacco used in Nicotine Fruit-tree Washes, *Dec. 3*, 1637.

Courtney, Lord
- Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Rep.*, *Dec. 3*, 1595–1597.

Cowan, Mr. W. H. [Surrey, Guildford].
- Surrey—Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 25*, 374.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
- British Indians in the Transvaal—Case of Mr. Ghandi, *Nov. 30*, 1072.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1117–1119, 1153, 1155.
- Old - Age Pension — Filial Contribution through Poor Law Guardians, *Nov. 30*, 1087.

Craig, Captain J. [Down, E.]
- Army Officers, Tailors recommended to, *Dec. 3*, 1638.
- Dunleer Land, Disposal of, *Dec. 3*, 1685.
- Dundrum Bay, Illegal Trawling in, *Dec. 3*, 1701.
- Firearm Traffic, Regulation of, *Dec. 3*, 1697.
- National School Teachers
  - Junior Assistants—Standard of Efficiency required, *Nov. 30*, 1061.
  - Salaries, Procedure in dealing with Claims, *Nov. 30*, 1063.
- Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1737–1740.
- Towerhill Cattle-Drive on 7th inst., *Nov. 26*, 684.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
- Ballyscullion Police Hut, *Dec. 3*, 1691.
- Clare, Condition of, *Nov. 26*, 692.
- Firearm Traffic, Regulation of, *Dec. 3*, 1697.
- Irish Language, Cost of Teaching in Schools, *Nov. 26*, 688.
- Land Purchase—Amount required, *Nov. 27*, 942.
- Magistrates—Threatening Letters received in Ireland, *Nov. 26*, 687.
- Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1744–1746.
- Riverstown United Irish League Intimidation Prosecution, *Nov. 26*, 687, 688.

Craig, Mr. C. C.—*cont.*
- United Irish League Activity in 1907, *Nov. 26*, 686, 687.
- Toome—Prosecution for Illicit Distilling, *Dec. 3*, 1691.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities].
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 152, 198.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 520; *Nov. 26*, 791–797.
  - Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1575.
- Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1732.

Cranworth, Lord
- Took the Oath, *Nov. 25*, 257.

Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]
- Torpedo-Boat Destroyers, Allocation of Contracts for, *Nov. 24*, 91.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies.*
- Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill—Proposals as to, *Dec. 2*, 1425.
- Army
  - Loan Expenditure, *Dec. 3*, 1608, 1609.
  - Strength of, *Dec. 3*, 1608.
  - Territorial Force, Organisation of, *Dec. 3*, 1608, 1610.
- Business of the House, Course of—Measures to be Passed, etc., *Dec. 2*, 1422, 1423.
- Incest Bill, 2R., *Dec. 2*, 1411.
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 280–299; *Nov. 26*, 627; *Nov. 27*, 850, 915.
- Medical Inspection of School Children—Grant to Local Authorities, etc., *Dec. 2*, 1400–1404.

Criminal Appeal [Amendment] Bill.
- *c.* Report from Standing Committee A, *Nov. 25*, 416.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
- Civil Service Pensions—Counting of Unestablished Service, *Nov. 30*, 1077.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1369.
- Ingatestone Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc., *Nov. 26*, 672.
- Navy
  - Portsmouth Lock—Wages paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason, *Nov. 30*, 1068.
  - Shipbuilding—Orders for Unarmoured Cruisers, *Dec. 3*, 1658.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Poor Relief Disqualification — Position of Pensioners, *Nov. 26*, 702.
  - Wages—Allocation between Husband and Wife, *Dec. 2*, 1459.

[*cont.*

Crooks, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary Reform Proposals, *Dec. 3*, 1706.
  Soldiers—Training for Civil Employment, *Dec. 2*, 1452.
  Women Teachers, Statistics as to, *Nov. 26*, 676.
  Woolwich — Privilege Cabs at Arsenal Station, *Nov. 30*, 1078; *Dec. 3*, 1623.
  Workington — Case of J. J. Jelly, *Dec. 2*, 1452; *Dec. 3*, 1627.

Crosbie Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1699.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 207.
  North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1227, 1228.

Crossgar
  Labourers' Cottages Scheme.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 385.

Cullinan, Mr J. [Tipperary, S.]
  Holycross—Arrest of Persons concerned in Disturbance, *Nov. 26*, 692.

Cunard Line
  Subsidy Agreement as to Freights.
    Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 27*, 938.

Curraheen
  School Erection Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 129.

Curran, Mr. P. [Durham, Jarrow]
  Admiralty Shipbuilding Contracts, Allocation of, *Dec. 3*, 1661.
  Jarrow Unemployed, Admiralty Work for, *Dec. 2*, 1444.
  Unemployment—Disfranchisement Regulations, *Dec. 2*, 1459, 1460.

Dangerous Performances on the Stage
  Prohibition of, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 30*, 1083.

Davies, Mr. E. W. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
  Cattle-Breeding, Funds available for improving, *Dec. 3*, 1681.
  Dinorwic Quarries—Employment and Accident Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 107.
  Mine Timber—Value of Welsh Larch, *Dec. 1*, 1255.
  Old-Age Pensions
    Claims, Publication of, *Dec. 1*, 1254.
    Regulations—Welsh Translation proposed, *Nov. 24*, 107.

Davies, Mr. E. W.—*cont.*
  Slates—Import Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 111; *Nov. 26*, 676.
  Small Holdings—Names of Applicants, Practice of furnishing to Private Landowners, *Nov. 26*, 684.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
  Old-Age Pension Claims, Information as to, *Nov. 25*, 393; *Nov. 30*, 1076.

Death Duties
  Estate Duty Office—Salaries and Promotion of Clerks.
    Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 30*, 1092.

Debtors
  (Imprisonment)—Report of Select Committee, Presented, *Dec. 2*, 1476.

Deering Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1061.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
  Caldbeck Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 3*, 1688.
  Caploughlan—Education Commissioners' Estate, Sale of, *Nov. 30*, 1062.
  National School Teachers' Grant, Distribution of, *Nov. 27*, 942.
  Rathdowney Petty Sessions—Case of P. Sweeny, *Nov. 30*, 1063.

Denman, Lord
  Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill, 2R., *Dec. 1*, 1232.

Destructive Insects and Pests Act
  Inspectors appointed.
    Qs. Mr. L. Hardy; *As.* Mr. Fuller, *Dec. 3*, 1680.

Dick Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1061.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
  Children, Employment of—Enforcement of Section 3 (4) and (5) of Act of 1903, *Nov. 25*, 394, 395.
  Congo Free State—British Vice-Consuls, etc. *Dec. 1*, 1253.
  Nigerian Munshis, Military Expeditions against, *Nov. 24*, 99.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
  Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 731–742. *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1107, 1153–1160, 1188, 1200, 1201.
    Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 967.
    Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1562–1567.

[*cont.*

Dillon, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Persia
Constitution, Granting of, *Nov. 26,* 665, 666.
Papers, Tabling of, *Nov. 26,* 666.
Russian Officers employed by the Shah, *Nov. 26,* 665.
Situation in, *Nov. 26,* 665.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3,* 1736.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 243–246, 250, 254.

Dinorwic Quarries
Employment and Accident Statistics.
Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 24,* 107.

Diplomatic and Consular Service
Industrial Development, Reports on.
Qs. Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 30,* 1073.

Diseases of Animals
[*See also Names of Diseases.*]
"Armenian," "Crown Point" and "Manchester Trader"—Orders Presented, *Dec. 2,* 1393, 1429.
"Marquette" and "Minnehaha," ss.—Orders 7605 and 7606 Presented, *Nov. 30,* 1022, 1045.
"Minneapolis," Order as to Presented, *Dec. 1,* 1235; *Dec. 2,* 1393.
"Titian" Order as to, Presented, *Dec. 3,* 1593, 1620.

Dobson, Mr. T. W. [Plymouth]
Mitcham Common Improvements, Grant for, *Dec. 1,* 1259.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Dogs
Stray, Disposal of.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 24,* 107.

Domville Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30,* 1065.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Aliens Act Administration—Definition of "Immigrant Ship," etc., *Dec. 2,* 1412–1415.
Children Bill, 3R., *Nov. 30,* 1036, 1039, 1041, 1043.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Companies Consolidation Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3,* 1755.
White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill, *Con., Dec. 3,* 1750.

Douglas Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. Phillips; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30,* 1049.

Dove
Petty Sessions—Case of Barber.
Q. Mr. Belloc; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 1,* 1256.

Dublin
Metropolitan Police—Upkeep, Expenditure on, Return Ordered, *Nov. 24,* 81; Presented, *Dec. 2,* 1427.

Duffy, Mr. W. T. [Galway, S.]
Floods—Prevention in Ireland, *Dec. 2,* 1435.
Kilrecle—Land Unsold and Condition of District, *Nov. 30,* 1100.
Whyte-Blake Estate, Sale Proposals, etc. *Nov. 30,* 1100.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanark, Govan]
Colonial Immigration Laws, *Dec. 3,* 1666.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 184, 185, 208.
Hollow Ware, Lead Used in Lining, *Nov. 26,* 670.
Naval Volunteer Reserve—Decision as to Signal Rating and Issue of Kits, *Nov. 30,* 1068.

Dundrum Bay
Illegal Trawling in.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3,* 1623.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3,* 1701.

Dunleer
Land, Disposal of.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3,* 1685.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Farms, Offer of, for Small Holdings when Vacant.
Qs. Mr. Rogers, Mr. Winfrey; *As.* Mr. Tomkinson, *Dec. 3,* 1682.

Edenderry
Labourers' Cottages Scheme, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec 3,* 1687.

Education Board
President—Rt. Hon. W. Runciman.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. Trevelyan.
Circular 576, Cause for Issuing.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25,* 399.
Circular 596—Wording of Paragraph 7 (*a*).
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25,* 398.
Medical Officers, *Status* of.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25,* 399.

Education, England and Wales

[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]

Accommodation and Attendance Statistics.
Q. Mr. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 24*, 86.

Building Grants—Statement of Cases Presented, *Nov. 27*, 934; *Nov. 30*, 1021.

Expenditure by Local Authorities, Statement as to.
Qs. Mr. James Hope, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25*, 401.
Q. Mr. James Hope; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 3*, 1628.

German in Secondary Schools.
Os. Sir P. Magnus, Mr. Speaker, *Dec. 2*, 1458.

Maintenance of Schools, Expenditure on—Statement Presented, *Nov. 24*, 22, 80.

Medical Inspection, Cost of, and Grant for.
Os. Viscount Galway, *Dec. 2*, 1394–1397, 1406; Lord Belper, 1397–1400, 1402, 1403; Earl of Crewe, 1400–1404; Viscount Midleton, 1404; Lord Clifford of Chudleigh, 1405; Lord Fitzmaurice, 1406, 1407.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 3*, 1627.

Religious Instruction—Teaching of the Apostles' Creed.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 4*, 1758.

Roman Catholic School Attendance.
Qs. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, Sir G. Parker, Mr. Myer; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1463.

Secondary Schools and Pupil-Teacher Centres—Return Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1757.

Teachers

Irish Training, Recognition of.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 26*, 677.

Salaries, Expenditure on.
Q. Mr. James Hope; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 4*, 1760.

Women, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 26*, 676.

Education, Ireland

[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]

Girls' Schools Closed and Amalgamated.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1270.

Grants—Comparison with Great Britain.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 2*, 1473.

Inspectorship — Appointment projected.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 385.

Education, Ireland—*cont.*

Intermediate

Inspectorate.
Qs. Mr. Kettle, Mr. Hazleton; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1695.

Rule 49, Interpretation of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 126.

National School Teachers

Grant, Distribution of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 942.

Junior Assistants—Standard of Efficiency required.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1061.

Pension Rules Presented, *Dec. 1* 1229, 1234.

Salaries

Assistants, Payment to.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 644; *Dec. 3*, 1645.

Delay in Paying.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1438.

Procedure in dealing with Claims.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1063.

Return Ordered, *Dec. 1*, 1235.

Workhouse Teachers, *see under* Workhouses—Irish School Teachers

Education, Scotland

Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair

[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]

Secondary Schools, Particulars as to.
Qs. Mr. Menzies; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 30*, 1093; *Dec. 2*, 1470.

Education (Scotland) Bill

c. Con., Nov. 24, 147.
3R.* *Nov. 24*, 221.
l. 1R.* *Nov. 25*, 370.

Debate on Consideration [Commons], *Nov. 24*, 147.

Clause 14—Omission of Subsection (1) proposed, 149–151.

Clause 15—Omission of Subsection (2), 161, 164.

Cumulative Vote, Retention of, 203–208.

Department

Designation as Scottish Education Department, 211.

Transfer from London to Edinburgh, proposed, 214–216.

Discussion, Time allowed for, 212, 213.

Fund, Allocation of, 161–177.

Gaelic, Provision for teaching of, 152–158.

[*cont.*

Education (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
- Debate on consideration [Commons]—*cont*
  - Government Amendments, 147, 148, 149, 182, 202, 212.
  - Necessitous Districts, Special Aid for, proposed, 177–180.
  - Roman Catholic Schools, Position of, 150, 216–218.
  - Schemes to be laid before Parliament, 180.
  - School Boards
    - Election—Postponement till 1911, proposed, 200–202.
    - Unification of—Powers of Education Board, 184, 185.
  - Surcharges on Expenditure, Provision as to, 186–195.
  - Voluntary Schools, Grants to, 149–151.
- Deputations in connection with.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Pirie, Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 24*, 125.

Edwards, Mr. A. C. [Denbigh District]
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 440–451; *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1363–1366, 1370, 1372, 1375.
  - Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 1003–1004.

Egypt
- Provincial Councils—Draft Decree for Amendment of Constitution.
  - *Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 24*, 101.

Electric Lighting
- Accounts—Appointment of Auditors.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. A. Hardy; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 24*, 112.

Elementary Education [England and Wales] (No. 2) Bill.
- c. 2R., *Nov. 25*, 417; *Nov. 26*, 707; *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1106; *Dec. 1*, 1276; *Dec. 2*, 1476.
- Allocation of Time to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Asquith, Mr. K. Hardie, *Nov. 25*, 415; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, Lord R. Cecil, *Nov. 26*, 703.
  - Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Nov. 27*, 944, 1015–1020.
- Associations, Formation of.
  - *Qs.* Sir H. Kimber, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Lord E. Talbot, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1465.
- Attendance, Effect on.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rawlinson; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 1*, 1236.
- Children in Attendance—Definition of Term.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25*, 402.

Elementary Education [England and Wales] (No. 2) Bill—*cont.*
- Clause 1 (2) (*a*), Interpretation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 26*, 678.
- Clause 1 (3)—Application of exception.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 3*, 1678.
- Clause 2
  - Draft Regulations Presented, *Nov. 27*, 827, 934.
  - Right of Entry in Single-room Schools.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Mildmay, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 1*, 1260.
- Clause 2 (5), Tabling of Regulations made under.
  - *Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 24*, 85.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25*, 403.
- Clause 3, Interpretation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1464.
- Contracted-out Schools.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 4*, 1763.
- Foreign Systems, Information as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Boland; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 26*, 664.
- Furniture of Contracting-out Schools.
  - *Q.* Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 26*, 678.
- Grants
  - Allocation of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. James Hope, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25*, 400.
    - *Q.* Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 4*, 1759.
  - Appeal against Allocation.
    - *Q.* Sir H. Kimber; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1465.
  - Exemption of London from Limitation, proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. W. Pearce; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1635.
  - Parliamentary—Resolution (Mr. Runciman), *Nov. 30*, 1211; Reported, *Dec. 2*, 1546.
- Negotiations, Result of.
  - *Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 30*, 1105.
- Questions on.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 2*, 1475.
- Religious Instruction, Allocation of time for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1464.
- Roman Catholic School Grant, Effect on.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Chamberlain; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 30*, 1090.
- Schoolhouse, Definition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. L. Hardy; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 3*, 1627.

[*cont.*

Elementary Education [England and Wales] (No. 2) Bill—*cont.*
  Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, Effect on.
    Qs. Sir P. Magnus, Sir W. Anson, Mr. James Hope; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1461.
    Q. Sir P. Magnus; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 3*, 1629.
  Section 1 (2) (*b*), Interpretation of.
    Qs. Mr. G. Gooch, Mr. Thorne; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1464.
  Suspension of Eleven o'Clock Rule—*Motion* (Mr. Asquith), *Nov. 26*, 704.
  Systematic Moral Instruction, Facilities for.
    Q. Mr. G. Gooch; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 26*, 678.
  Teachers, Position of.
    Q. Mr. S. Wortley; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 3*, 1677.
  Withdrawal of.
    Qs. Sir F. Banbury, Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 2*, 1475; Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 4*, 1766.

Ellenborough, Lord
  Chatham, Docking Accommodation at, *Nov, 24*, 66, 67.
  Merchant Shipping Officers—Objections to granting Certificates to Foreigners, *Nov. 24*, 75.
  Navy
    Docking Accommodation for Vessels of "Dreadnought" Class, *Nov. 24*, 65–69.
    Repairs, Number of Vessels undergoing, *Nov. 24*, 39.
    Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 24*, 36–40, 65.

Ellis, Rt. Hon. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
  Educational Accommodation and Attendance Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 86.
  Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 741–745.

Ely Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1273.

Emigrants Information Office
  Colonial Immigration Laws, *see* Colonies.

Ennis
  Unemployment Grant.
    Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 130.

Erroll, Earl of
  Army
    Garrisoning of Stations Abroad, Provision for, *Dec. 3*, 1603.
    Reserve—Strength on Mobilisation *Dec. 3*, 1600.
    Special Reserve, Strength of, *Dec. 3*, 1598, 1599.
    Strength compared with three years ago, *Dec. 3*, 1597–1601.

Essex, Mr. R. W. [Gloucestershire, Cirencester)
  Agriculture
    Departmental Funds devoted to Irish Agriculture, *Dec. 3*, 1702.
    Grant in England, *Dec. 3*, 1679.
  Colonial Immigration Rules, *Nov. 24*, 95, 96.
  Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1359–1361; *Dec. 2*, 1518.
  Gloucestershire Telegraph Facilities, *Dec. 3*, 1677.
  Irish Agricultural Exports (1897 and 1907). *Dec. 2*, 1436.
  Marston Sicca—Cooper School Scheme, *Dec. 3*, 1628.

Eversley, Lord
  Navy
    Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 24*, 56, 57, 59.
    Short Service System, Advantages of, *Nov. 24*, 58.
    Two-Power Standard, Definition and Maintenance of, *Nov. 24*, 53–56.
  Navy Estimates—Increase in certain Items during last Ten Years, *Nov. 24*, 57, 58.

Evictions, Ireland
  See under Ireland.

Exports and Imports
  Foreign Import Duties—Statement Presented, *Dec. 1*, 1234; *Dec. 2*, 1393.

Faber, Lord
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 590–597.

Faber, Captain W. V. [Hants, Andover]
  Army
    Horses—Oat Supply System, *Dec. 2*, 1449.
    Inniskilling Dragoons Promotions and Transfers, *Dec. 2*, 1450, 1451.
  Indian Army—Method of effecting Change of Stations, *Nov. 24*, 82.

Fairfax Peerage
  Representative Peers for Scotland, Claim to Vote at Elections of, *Nov. 24*, 1.

Farm Labourers
  Migratory, Accommodation provided for.
    Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 1*, 1240.

Farrell, Mr. J. [Longford, N.]
  King-Harman Estate—Agreements for Ballinamuck Portion, *Nov. 26*, 699.
  Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill—Proposals as to, *Nov. 30*, 1096.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
- Aliens—Children of Deported Persons, Case of Schafer, *Nov. 26*, 670.
- All-British Mail Route—Progress of Negotiations, *Nov. 30*, 1083, 1084.
- Liverpool—Chinese Immigration Statistics, *Nov. 25*, 393, 394.
- Navy
  - Chatham Dockyard Channel—Dredging Proposals, *Nov. 26*, 648.
  - Medway Floating Dock Scheme, *Nov. 26*, 648.
- Soudan
  - Lado Enclave
    - Destruction of Elephants, *Dec. 3*, 1670.
    - Position in, *Nov. 30*, 1074, 1075, 1104.
  - Preservation of Wild Game, *Dec. 3*, 1670, 1671.

Fenwick, Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
- Old-Age Pensions—Method of reckoning Married Persons' Income, *Nov. 30*, 1046.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 154, 176, 181, 182, 194, 204.

Fermanagh
- Evicted Tenants, Position of.
  Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 941.
- Vaughan's Charitable School, Administration of.
  Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1050.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act
- General Regulations Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1757.

Fethard
- Coastguard Station, Use for.
  Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 30*, 1057.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G. [Fermanagh, N.]
- Ardess School—Case of Miss G. Knox, *Nov. 24*, 89.
- Army Bandsmen—Training at Kneller Hall, *Nov. 30*, 1053.
- Fairs, Whisky sold at, *Dec. 4*, 1763.
- Fermanagh Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 27*, 941.
- King-Harman Estate—Turbary Rights, *Nov. 30*, 1098.
- Land Purchase Act, 1891—Section 2, Rules made under, *Nov. 25*, 382.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G.—*cont.*
- Liquor Traffic
  - Licensed Publicans appointed as Postmasters in Ireland, *Nov. 25*, 398.
  - Reform Proposals, *Nov. 25*, 381.
  - Taxation—Assistant Surveyorships, Examinations for, *Nov. 24*, 87.

Fever Hospitals
- Inspection System.
  Qs. Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 2*, 1460.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
- Boxwell Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 26*, 689.
- Ely Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 1*, 1273.
- Farm Labourers, Migratory, Accommodation provided for, *Dec. 1*, 1240.
- Fethard Coastguard Station, Use for, *Nov. 30*, 1057.
- Leigh Estate—Case of E. Egan, *Dec. 1*, 1274.
- Poor Law Returns, Payment of Expense of Furnishing, *Nov. 26*, 652.
- Sigginshaggard Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 30*, 1048.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Civil Service Pensions, New Scheme for, *Nov. 30*, 1058.
- Railways, Irish
  - Cattle Transit Arrangements, *Dec. 3*, 1648.
  - Lodging-Houses provided for Guards' etc., State of, *Nov. 30*, 1054.
  - Midland Great Western—Hours of Duty of Firemen, etc., *Nov. 30*, 1054.
- Trade, Board of—Formation of Arbitration Board, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1053.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Fiscal Policy
- Foreign Countries and their Colonies, Relations between.
  Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1675.

Fiscal Policy of International Trade
- Circumstances of Preparation of.
  Qs. Mr. B. Law, Mr. A. Chamberlain; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 24*, 103.
- Publication of.
  Q. Mr. J. Collings; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1633.
- Revision before Publication.
  Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26*, 650.

Fisheries
  [*See also Names of Places, Rivers, etc.*]
  Scottish New Cruiser.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Dec. 1*, 1237.

Fitzmaurice, Lord—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 894–906.
  Medical Inspection of School Children—Grant to Local Authorities, etc., *Dec. 2*, 1406, 1407.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
  Crosbie Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 3*, 1699, 1700.
  Firearm Traffic, Regulation of, *Dec. 3*, 1697.
  Franks Estate, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 26*, 698.
  Killarney Fair Rent Appeals, Decisions in, *Nov. 26*, 699.
  Munster Land Purchase Prices, *Dec. 3*, 1693.
  Ormathwaite Estate Evicted Tenants. Position of, *Dec. 3*, 1699.

Fleetwood, Rynd and Others, Estate of
  Sale Proposals.
    Q. Mr. John O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1243.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
  Fuge Estate, Purchase of, *Dec. 3*, 1686.
  Grehan Estate—Case of Mr. T. Barrett, *Dec. 3*, 1644.
  Trade Frauds, Prevention of, *Dec. 3*, 1701, 1702

Folkestone
  Unemployment—Application for Distress Committee.
    Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1632.

Food and Drugs Act
  Administration in Ireland.
    Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 645.

Foot and Mouth Disease
  American Outbreaks.
    Os. Earl of Onslow, Earl Carrington, *Nov. 24*, 24.
    Q. Mr. L. Hardy; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 25*, 404.
    Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Cooper; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 1*, 1261.
    Q. Mr. L. Hardy; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 2*, 1430.
  Order Prohibiting Landing of Animals Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1757.

Foreign Office
  Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
  Under-Secretary—Mr. T. McK. Wood.
  Small Wars Undertaken against Native Tribes.
    Qs. Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 3*, 1665.
  Women Clerks in First and Second Division.
    Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 2*, 1435.

Forster, Mr. H. W. [Kent, Sevenoaks]
  Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1338, 1348; *Dec. 2*, 1515.
    Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 951–957.
  Ingatestone Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc., *Nov. 26*, 672.
  Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1730.
  Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 255.

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
  Small Holdings—Rent, Basis of Calculating, *Nov. 26*, 655.

Franks Estates
  Sale Proposals.
    Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 698.

Fruit Trees
  Spraying Regulations—Issue of Leaflet, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. Fuller, *Dec. 3*, 1681.

Fuge Estate
  Purchase Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1686.

Fuller, Mr. J. M. F. [Wiltshire, Westbury]
  Agriculture Grant in England, *Dec. 3*, 1679.
  Cattle-breeding, Funds available for Improving, *Dec. 3*, 1681.
  Destructive Insects and Pests Act—Inspectors appointed, *Dec. 3*, 1680.
  Fruit-Trees, Leaflet as to Spraying, *Dec. 3*, 1682.
  Gooseberry Mildew Outbreaks, *Dec. 3*, 1679.
    Winter Course of Disease in, *Dec. 3*, 1680.
  Small Holdings—Land held by Co-operative Societies, *Dec. 3*, 1679.

Galway
  Constabulary
    County Inspectors' Salaries.
      Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1443.

[*cont.*

Galway—*cont.*

Constabulary—*cont.*

Extra Police employed.

Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 698.

Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1046.

Inspectors and Head Constables.

Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 386.

Lewis, Mr., Police Protection of.

Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1051.

Galway, Viscount

Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 633–635.

Medical Inspection of School Children—Grant to Local Authorities, etc., *Dec. 2*, 1394–1397, 1406.

Germany

Essen Railway, Government Reservation of.

Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 24*, 101.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]

Castlerea Union, Seed Rate uncollected in, *Nov. 25*, 382.

Chapman Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 1*, 1268.

Harlech Estate

Bogland, Disposal of, *Dec. 1*, 1242.

Market House—Use for, *Dec. 1*, 1242.

Joly Estate—Cases of Mrs. Killen and Mrs. Hobson, *Nov. 25*, 383.

Land Act, 1903, Section 3, Land purchased under, *Nov. 25*, 381.

Land Purchase

Mortgage of Holding and Subsequent Eviction, Cases of, *Dec. 1*, 1268.

Residents in and out of Ireland, Payments to, *Nov. 24*, 127.

Milltown—Disposal of Mr. Fetherston's Ranch, *Nov. 24*, 126.

Mullingar District Lunatic Asylum Accounts, *Nov. 26*, 640.

National School Teachers' Salaries, Delay in Paying, *Dec. 2*, 1438.

Pakenham Estate Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *Nov. 24*, 127.

Potts Estate, Situation on, *Nov. 25*, 384.

Roscommon Agricultural and Technical Committee, Allegations against, *Dec. 1*, 1239.

Small Holdings—Communications sent to Defaulting Councils, *Dec. 1*, 1263.

Westmeath Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Dec. 2*, 1439.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]

Aldridge Colliery, Accidents at, *Nov. 26*, 641.

Aliens—Children of Deported Persons, Case of Schafer, *Nov. 26*, 671.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*

Anæsthetics, Administration of—Case of A. Lebathe, *Nov. 26*, 656.

Cabs, Taximeter—Privileges at Railway Stations, *Nov. 26*, 642.

Children, Employment of—Enforcement of Section 3 (4) and (5) of Act of 1903, *Nov. 25*, 394, 395.

Coroners' Inquests, Press Representation at, *Nov. 25*, 394; *Nov. 30*, 1080, 1081; *Dec. 3*, 1626.

County Courts Procedure, Committee to Consider, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1624.

Dangerous Performances on the Stage, Prohibition of, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1083.

Dinorwic Quarries, Employment and Accident Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 107.

Dogs, Stray, Disposal of, *Nov. 24*, 108.

Dove Petty Sessions—Case of Barber, *Dec. 1*, 1256.

Grangemouth Dock Labour Dispute, *Dec. 3*, 1625.

Guernsey—Furze Burning on l'Ancresse Common, *Nov. 26*, 669.

Hollow Ware, Lead used in Lining, *Nov. 26*, 670.

Ingatestone Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc., *Nov. 26*, 672; *Nov. 30*, 1081, 1082.

Juvenile Offenders—Consultative Committee to deal with Matters relating to, proposed *Nov. 24*, 110.

Licensing Act, 1904—Loans, Period for Repaying, *Dec. 3*, 1624.

Linlithgow—Polish Miners, Date of Naturalisation, *Nov. 26*, 670.

Liverpool Chinese Immigration Statistics, *Nov. 25*, 393, 394.

Matches—Use of White Phosphorus, *Dec. 1*, 1256.

Mine Timber—Value of Welsh Larch, *Dec. 1*, 1255.

Oxford Circus—Police Arrangements during Royal Procession, *Nov. 24*, 109.

Oxford Street—Building Accidents on Waring-White Works, *Dec. 1*, 1257.

Petrol

Accidents from Explosion of, *Nov. 24*, 108, 109.

Storage—Use of Safety Devices, *Nov. 24*, 108.

Police, Complaints against, System of dealing with, *Nov. 26*, 668.

Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 224–227, 229–233, 241, 246–256.

Westminster—Case of Trew, *Nov. 24*, 82.

White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill, *Con.*, *Dec. 3*, 1747–1750, 1753.

Women Clerks and Inspectors in the Home Office, *Dec. 3*, 1621.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*

Women's Suffrage Movement

Gaskell, Mrs. Penn and Miss Smith, Case of, *Nov. 26*, 668, 669.

Prison Treatment, *Nov. 30*, 1079.

Woolwich—Privilege Cabs at Arsenal Station, *Nov. 30*, 1079; *Dec. 3*, 1624.

Workington—Case of J. J. Jelly, *Dec. 2*, 1453; *Dec. 3*, 1627.

Glantawr, Lord

Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 635–638.

Glasgow

Young Men's Christian Association Classes, Position of.

Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Dec. 1*, 1266.

Glendinning, Mr. R. [Antrim, N.]

Hayti—Protection of British Subjects, *Dec. 3*, 1644.

Glenflesk

Railway Station for, proposed.

Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 25*, 379.

Gloucestershire

Telegraph Facilities.

Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 3*, 1677.

Glover, Mr. T. [St. Helens]

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 26*, 700; *Dec. 3*, 1707.

Gooch, Mr. G. P. [Bath]

Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill.

Section 1 (2) (*b*) Interpretation of, *Dec. 2*, 1464.

Systematic Moral Instruction, Facilities for, *Nov. 26*, 678.

Gooseberry Mildew

Fungicides used.

Q. Mr. L. Hardy; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 30*, 1055.

Order Presented, *Dec. 3*, 1593, 1620.

Outbreak.

Q. Mr. L. Hardy; *A.* Mr. Fuller *Dec. 3*, 1679.

Prohibition of Importation of Bushes—Order Presented, *Nov. 24*, 23, 81.

Winter, Course of Disease in.

Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Fuller, *Dec. 3*, 1680.

Gore-Booth Estate

Sale Proposals.

Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1442.

Gortdromerillagh

Moonlighting Outrage on 19th inst.

Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 692.

Government Departments

Blotting-Paper and Ink, Supply of.

Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 24*, 117.

Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Hodge; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 26*, 679.

Contracts—Wages of Carpenters.

Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 27*, 940.

Supplies for—Place of Origin.

Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 26*, 648.

Granard, Earl of

Navy

Docking Accommodation for Vessels of "Dreadnought" Class, *Nov. 24*, 36, 65, 68, 69.

Guns and Gun-Mountings, Provision for, *Nov. 24*, 34, 64.

Home Fleet Manœuvres, Result of, *Nov. 24*, 64.

Rosyth, Date of Completion, *Nov. 24*, 36.

Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 24*, 34, 64.

Stores, Reserve of, *Nov. 24*, 35.

Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Construction Policy, *Nov. 24*, 35.

Two-Power Standard, Definition and Maintenance of, *Nov. 24*, 34, 36, 65.

Grangemouth

Dock Labour Dispute.

Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 3*, 1625.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]

Ingatestone Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc., *Nov. 26*, 671, 672; *Nov. 30*, 1082.

Portsmouth Lock—Wages paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason, *Nov. 30*, 1068.

Questions—Procedure in asking on Friday, *Nov. 27*, 943.

Grays Thurrock

Unemployment—Application for Distress Committee.

Q. Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1630.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]

Police, Complaints against, System of dealing with, *Nov. 26*, 668.

Women's Suffrage Movement—Cases of Mrs. Gaskell, Penn. and Miss Smith, *Nov. 26*, 668, 669.

Grehan Estate
Case of Mr. T. Barrett.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1644.

Gretton, Mr. J. [Rutland]
Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Allocation of Contracts for, *Nov. 24*, 91.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
Afghanistan—Prevention of Gun-running, *Dec. 1*, 1254.
Congo Free State—British Vice-Consuls and Travelling Facilities, *Dec. 1*, 1253.
Egyptian Provincial Councils—Draft Decree for Amendment of Constitution, *Nov. 24*, 101.
Foreign Systems of Education, Information as to, *Nov. 26*, 664.
Germany—Government Reservation of Essen Railway, *Nov. 24*, 101.
Hayti Disturbances—Protection of British Subjects, *Nov. 26*, 663, 664; *Dec. 3*, 1644, 1669, 1670.
International Naval Conference
  Parliamentary Consent to Conclusions, *Nov. 24*, 103.
  Powers invited to take part in, *Nov. 24*, 103.
Opium Conference—Opinions of British Delegates, *Dec. 3*, 1669.
Persia
  British Government Policy in, *Nov. 26*, 667, 668.
  Constitution, Granting of, *Nov. 26*, 665, 666.
  Liakhoff, Colonel, Position of, *Nov. 24*, 100; *Dec. 3*, 1671.
  Papers, Tabling of, *Nov. 26*, 667.
  Parliament, Proposals as to, *Nov. 24*, 102.
  Russian Government Attitude, *Nov. 24*, 102.
  Russian Officers employed by the Shah, *Nov. 26*, 665.
  Situation in, *Nov. 26*, 665.
Small Wars undertaken against Native Tribes, *Dec. 3*, 1665.
Soudan
  Lado Enclave—Destruction of Elephants, *Dec. 3*, 1670.
  Wild Game, Preservation of, *Dec. 3*, 1670, 1671.
Women Clerks in the Foreign Office, *Dec. 2*, 1435.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Army Engineer Services, Royal—Payment of Removal Expenses, *Nov. 26*, 659.

Grindleton
Churchyard Extension Proposals.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. Tomkinson, *Nov. 25*, 373.

Guernsey
Furze-burning on l'Ancresse Common.
Q. Mr. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 669.

Guinness, Mr. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill, *Con.*, *Dec. 3*, 1753.

Guinness, Mr. W. (Bury St. Edmunds]
Education (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 2*, 1510.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1783, 1784, 1803–1806, 1823, 1824.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 205, 211.
Rosyth Works—Sunday Labour, *Nov. 30*, 1069.

Gurdon, Rt. Hon. Sir W. B. [Norfolk]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 807–809.

Gurteen
Finnerty, M., Case of.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1703.
Police Patrol, Attack on.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1698.

Gwynn, Mr. S. L. [Galway]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1192–1194.
Irish Universities Bill—Charters, Issue of, *Nov. 26*, 643.
Science, Royal College of—Teaching Staff. Effect of Transfer on Income of, *Nov. 30*, 1090, 1091.

Hackney Marshes
Work for Unemployed on.
Q. Mr. Brooke; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 30*, 1056.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
Bandsmen—Training at Kneller Hall, *Nov. 30*, 1053.
Barracks, Insanitary, Return as to, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1071.
Carrickfergus, Military Designation of, *Nov. 26*, 659.
Cavalry—Distribution System, *Nov. 30*, 1070.
Cork Barracks, Labour employed on, *Nov. 26*, 654.
Engineer Services, Royal—Payment of Removal Expenses, *Nov. 26*, 659.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Expenditure of Great Britain and certain Foreign Countries, *Dec. 3*, 1656.
- Guns—Howitzer Trials, *Nov. 30*, 1072.
- Horses—Oat Supply System, *Dec. 2*, 1449.
- Infantry Battalions, Strength of, *Dec. 3*, 1655.
- Inniskilling Dragoons—Promotions and Transfers, *Dec. 2*, 1450, 1451.
- Irish Command, Constitution and Training of, *Nov. 30*, 1071.
- Officers
  - Colonels on Half-Pay, System of appointing, *Nov. 25*, 387.
  - Tailors recommended to, *Dec. 3*, 1638.
- Soldiers
  - Boot Making, Instruction in, *Dec. 2*, 1451.
  - Training for Civil Employment, *Dec.* , 1452.
- Territorial Force
  - Decorations for Transferred Volunteers, *Dec. 3*, 1639.
  - Efficiency Medal, Conditions of granting, *Dec. 3*, 1639.
  - Guns for, *Nov. 26*, 654.
  - Musketry Training
    - Committee, Names of, *Dec. 3*, 1640.
    - Instructional Practices, *Dec. 3*, 1643.
    - Marking and Supervision, *Dec. 3*, 1643.
    - Wind Gauge, Use of, *Dec. 3*, 1644.
  - Re-engagement, *Dec. 3*, 1640.
- War Office Boot Contracts (1898–1902), *Dec. 3*, 1640.

Halifax, Viscount
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 578.

Halsbury, Earl of
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 550–560.

Hamilton of Dalzell, Lord
- Merchant Shipping
  - Officers—Objections to granting Certificates to Foreigners, *Nov. 24*, 76, 77.
  - Sunday Labour on Ships lying in Port, *Nov. 30*, 1030–1032.

Hammersmith Bridge
- Protection of Embankment near.
  - *Q.* Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 24*, 112.

Hampstead
- Borough Council Expenditure on Robing Room, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1650.

Hampshire
- Small Holdings
  - Applications.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 24*, 120.
    - *Qs.* Mr. R. Harcourt, Mr. Montagu, *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 1*, 1264.
  - Scheme.
    - *Qs.* Mr. R. Harcourt; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 26*, 682.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
- Government Department Contracts—Wages of Carpenters, *Nov. 27*, 940.
- House of Commons—Allocation of Rooms, *Nov. 27*, 940.
- Mall to Charing Cross Improvement
  - Arches, Erection of, *Dec. 2*, 1467.
  - Roadway to Birdcage Walk, Widening of, *Nov. 30*, 1090.
- Parliament—Allocation of Rooms among Peers, Commons and Press, *Dec. 3*, 1652.
- Richmond Park, Nursery Garden in, *Dec. 2*, 1466, 1467.

Harcourt, Mr. R. [Montrose Burghs]
- Africa, South—Visit of Naval Squadron, Farewell Message of Admiral, *Nov. 25*, 389.
- Hampshire Small Holdings
  - Applications, Refusals of, *Dec. 1*, 1264.
  - Scheme, *Nov. 26*, 682.
- India—United Provinces, Famine in, *Dec. 1*, 1253.
- Small Holdings
  - Counties which have not submitted Schemes, *Nov. 24*, 119.
  - Defaulting Counties, Procedure in dealing with, *Nov. 24*, 119.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill—Allocation of Time to, *Nov. 25*, 416.
- India
  - Administrative Reform Proposals, *Dec. 1*, 1250.
  - Calcutta—House Accommodation for Government Officials, *Dec. 1*, 1252.
  - United Provinces, Famine in, *Dec. 1*, 1253.
- Navy—Shipbuilding Delay, Suggestions for obviating, *Nov. 25*, 388.

[*cont*

Hardie, Mr. J. K.—*cont.*
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1212–1214, 1218.
Old-Age Pensions—Filial Contribution through Poor Law Guardians, *Nov. 30*, 1087.
Railways
Combines—Tabling of Agreements, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 674.
North British Employees, civil Rights of, *Nov. 30*, 1084, 1085.

Hardinge, Viscount
Licensing Bill, 2R. *Nov. 27*, 842–844.

Hardy, Mr. G. A. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
Electric Lighting Accounts—Appointment of Auditors, *Nov. 24*, 112.
Indian Administrative Reform Proposals, *Dec. 1*, 1248.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
Business of the House, Course of, *Dec. 3*, 1708, 1709.
Destructive Insects and Pests Act—Inspectors appointed, *Dec. 3*, 1680.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1294, 1350.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 968–970, 1012.
Schoolhouse, Definition of, *Dec. 3*, 1627.
Foot-and-Mouth Disease—American Outbreak, *Nov. 25*, 404; *Dec. 2*, 1430.
Gooseberry Mildew
Fungicides used, *Nov. 30*, 1055.
Outbreaks, *Dec. 3*, 1679.
House of Commons' Galleries, Admission of the Public to, *Dec. 3*, 1707.

Harlech Estate
Bog Land, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1242.
Market-House, Use for.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1242.

Harmsworth, Mr. C. B. [Worcestershire, Droitwich]
Army—Territorial Force
Decorations for transferred Volunteers, *Dec. 3*, 1638.
Efficiency Medal, Granting of, *Dec. 3*, 1639.
Carpets, Foreign Prison-made, Importation of, *Nov. 30*, 1084.
Salt—Colonial and Foreign Import Duties, *Dec. 2*, 1429.

Harris, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 887–890.

Harrogate
Unemployment—Application for Distress Committee.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1632.

Hart-Davies, Mr. T. [Hackney, N.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1191.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 989.
Indian Army Charges, *Dec. 3*, 1664.
Mall to Charing Cross Improvement—Roadway to Birdcage Walk, Widening of, *Nov. 30*, 1089.
Persian Parliament, Proposals as to, *Nov. 24*, 102.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1171–1174.

Hastings Harbour Bill
*c. Rep**., *Nov. 25*, 370.
Con. and 3R*, *Nov. 30*, 1044.
l. 1R*, *Nov. 30*, 1021.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
Army—Colonels on Half-Pay, System of Appointing, *Nov. 25*, 387.
Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill
Clause 1 (3)—Application of Exception, *Dec. 3*, 1678.
Contracted-out Schools, *Dec. 4*, 1763.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
Roscommon—Case of T. Conboy, *Dec. 1*, 1269.

Hayti
Disturbances—Protection of British Subjects.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 26*, 649.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 26*, 663.
Q. Mr. Glendinning; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 3*, 1644.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 3*, 1669.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1290–1298.

Hazleton, Mr. R. [Galway, N.]
Deering Estate, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1061.
Dick Estate, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1061.
Education—Intermediate Inspectorate, *Dec. 3*, 1696.

[*cont.*

Hazleton, Mr. R.—*cont.*
- Galway Constabulary
  - County Inspectors' Salaries, *Dec. 2*, 1443.
  - Extra Police
    - Charges, Basis of calculating, *Nov. 26*, 697; *Dec. 2*, 1413.
    - Distribution of, *Nov. 26*, 698; *Nov. 30*, 1046.
    - Inspectors and Head Constables, *Nov. 25*, 386.
- Land Law Act, 1896—Rents of Joint Holdings, *Dec. 2*, 1442.
- O'Connor Estate, Rents on, *Nov. 30*, 1061.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
- Ceylon Tea-cess, Collection of, *Dec. 4*, 1761.
- Indian Telegrams (1903–7), *Dec. 2*, 1439.
- Postage Rates on Newspapers to and from Australia, *Dec. 2*, 1437.

Hedges, Mr. A. P. [Kent, Tonbridge]
- Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1731.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, N., Lancaster]
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 499–503.

Helmsley, Viscount [Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk]
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1138–1140; *Dec. 1*, 1361.
- Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1716, 1740.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
- Betting Telegrams, Transmission of, *Nov 25*, 397.
- Guernsey—Furze Burning on l'Ancresse Common, *Nov. 26*, 669.
- Petrol
  - Accidents from Explosion of, *Nov. 24*, 108.
  - Storage—Use of Safety Devices, *Nov. 24*, 108.
- Stretton Sugwas, Subpostmaster, Prosecution of, *Nov. 25*, 397.

Henderson, Mr. J. M. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 163, 199.
- North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1216.

Henry, Mr. C. S. [Shropshire, Wellington]
- Bills—Ascertaining House of Lords' Opinion before taking Committee Stage in House of Commons, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1104.

Hereford, Bishop of
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 601–614.

Hill, Viscount
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 858–863.

Historical Monuments.
- *See* Ancient Monuments.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Bristol, E.]
- Census of Production—Agriculture Returns, *Dec. 3*, 1637.
- Civil Service
  - Boy Clerkships, Examinations for, *Nov. 26*, 679.
  - Second Division Clerks
    - Examinations for, *Nov. 30*, 1057.
    - Salaries, *Nov. 30*, 1091, 1092; *Dec. 1*, 1265.
- Coastguard—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 24*, 117.
- Education Grants in Great Britain and Ireland, *Dec. 2*, 1473.
- Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill—Grants, Limitation of, *Dec. 3*, 1635.
- Estate Duty Office—Salaries and Promotion of Clerks, *Nov. 30*, 1092, 1093.
- Fethard Coastguard Station, Use for, *Nov. 30*, 1057.
- Fiscal Policy of International Trade, Publication of, *Dec. 3*, 1633.
- Government Departments
  - Blotting-paper and Ink, Supply of, *Nov. 24*, 117; *Nov. 26*, 680.
  - Supplies for—Place of Origin, *Nov. 26*, 648.
- Income-Tax on Scottish Commissioners' Clerks' Pay, *Nov. 26*, 648.
- Irish Land Bill, Clauses 3 (2) and (3), Interpretation of, *Nov. 30*, 1048.
- Irish Stationery Office Contracts, *Dec. 3*, 1704.
- Kingstown—Payment for Use of Carlisle Pier, *Dec. 2*, 1474.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Appeal against Rejection, Procedure as to, *Dec. 3*, 1635.
  - Decision of Points of Law, *Dec. 3*, 1636.
  - Fines on Officials for Communications to the Press, *Dec. 3*, 1638.
  - Irish Small Holdings, Calculation of Rent from, *Dec. 3*, 1634.
  - Officers, Pay of, *Dec. 3*, 1637.
  - Taxation required in respect of, *Dec. 3*, 1635.
- Science, Royal College of—Effect of Transfer on Income of Teaching Staff, *Nov. 30*, 1090, 1091.
- Scottish Sheriffs' Clerks, Allowances to, *Dec. 2*, 1468.
- Sligo, Leitrim and Northern Counties Railway, Grant to, *Nov. 30*, 1102.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*cont.*
Taxes—Appointment of Assistant Surveyors, *Dec. 3,* 1652.
Tobacco used in Nicotine Fruit-tree Washes, *Dec. 3,* 1637.
Tweed River Crown Fishery Leases granted, *Nov. 25,* 403, 404.
Westmeath Valuation, Cost of, *Dec. 4,* 1763.

Hodge, Mr. J. [Lancashire, S.E., Gorton.]
Government Departments — Blotting-paper Contracts, *Nov. 26,* 680.

Hogan, Mr. M. [Tipperary, N.]
Ballingarry — Land purchased by Mr. H. D. Kenny, *Nov. 24,* 131.
Saurin Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2,* 1471.
Trench Estate—Advance made to Mr. Carroll, *Nov. 24,* 130.

Hollow Ware
Lead used in lining.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards, Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26,* 669.

Holycross
Arrest of Persons concerned in Disturbance.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26,* 646.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26,* 692.
Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien, Mr. Belloc, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3,* 1694.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Right Hon. H. Gladstone.
Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.
Women Clerks and Inspectors employed.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 3,* 1621.

Hong Kong
Riots on 2nd ult.
Qs. Mr. Robinson; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 3,* 1668.

Hop Industry
Select Committee Recommendations, Action to be taken on.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 1,* 1241.

Hope, Mr. James (Sheffield, Central)
Education
Expenditure, *Nov. 25,* 401, 402; *Dec. 3,* 1628.
Teachers' Salaries, Expenditure on, *Dec. 4,* 1760.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 195, 196, 199, 203, 204.

Hope, Mr. James—*cont.*
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Nov. 30,* 1170; *Dec. 1,* 1368, 1388, 1389.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27,* 987–989.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2,* 1580.
Grants payable, *Nov. 25,* 400.
Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, Effect on, *Dec. 2,* 1462.
Questions—Circulation of Answers with the Votes, *Dec. 4,* 1766.

Horniman, Mr. E. J. [Chelsea]
Chelsea
King's Road Post Office, Hours of Business at, *Nov. 26,* 641.
Unemployment Schemes submitted, *Nov. 25,* 378.
Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief Disqualification, Interpretation of certain Cases, *Nov. 25,* 379.
Unemployment Metropolitan Borough Statistics, *Nov. 25,* 378.

Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill
c. Report from Standing Committtee B, *Dec. 3,* 1709.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 1,* 1355.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26,* 813–817; *Com., Nov. 30,* 1107, 1150.
Government Departments
Blotting-paper and Ink, Supply of, *Nov. 24,* 117; *Nov. 26,* 679, 680.
Supplies for—Place of Origin, *Nov. 26,* 648.
Navy
Changing of Officers and Crews, System of, *Nov. 24,* 91, 92.
Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Speed of, *Nov. 25,* 389.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [Yorkshire, W.R., Morley]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25,* 431–440; *Nov. 26,* 733; *Dec. 1,* 1323–1328.

Idris, Mr. T. H. W. [Flint Boroughs)
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3,* 1724.

Incest Bill
l. 2R., *Dec. 2,* 1407.
Com. and *Rep*., Dec. 3,* 1597.

Income Tax

Patent Royalties, Liability of.
 Q. Sir K. Kimber; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 25*, 392.

Schedule A, Valuation for.
 Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Dec. 3*, 1653.

Scottish Commissioners' Clerks, Pay of.
 Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 26*, 648.

India

Administrative Reform Proposals.
 Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Sir H. Cotton, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 24*, 94.
 Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 26*, 660.
 Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. G. A. Hardy, Mr. Mackarness, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 1*, 1248.

Anarchist Outrages, Proposals for dealing with.
 Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 3*, 1662.

Army

 Change of Stations, Method of Effecting.
  Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 24*, 82.

 Charges—Objections to Proposed Arrangement.
  Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 3*, 1647.
  Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 3*, 1664.

 Pay, Proposals for Increasing.
  Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 3*, 1664.

 Return as to Military Operations (1899–1908), Ordered, *Nov. 25*, 371; Presented, *Nov. 26*, 639.

Calcutta—House Accommodation for Government Officials.
 Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 1*, 1251.

Clough, Mr.—Cause for Murder of.
 Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 1*, 1250.

Coconada—Cost of Extra Police.
 Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 26*, 661.

Customs Revenue (1905–8), Return as to—Order of 16th June Read and Discharged and Order substituted, *Nov. 25*, 371; *Dec. 4*, 1758.

Dacca Student, Cause for Murder of.
 Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 24*, 93.

Education Policy.
 Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 26*, 661.

Hume, Mr.—Attempt to Assassinate.
 Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 1*, 1250.

India—*cont.*

Jhansi—Sentence on Brahmin for Tampering with Troops.
 Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan Mr. Speaker, *Dec. 3*, 1663.

Labour Agencies—Government Assistance to, proposed.
 Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 26*, 661.

Malarial Fever, Prevalence of and Measures taken to deal with.
 Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 1*, 1251.

Marine Department—Grievances of Clerks.
 Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Buchanan *Nov. 24*, 93.

Mysore—Position of Converts from Hinduism.
 Q. Mr. E. H. Lamb; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 30*, 1060.

Seditious Literature sent through French Colonies.
 Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan *Dec. 1*, 1251.

Simla—Boundary of Penrore Estate.
 Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 25*, 380.

Telegrams, (1903–7).
 Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Dec. 2*, 1439.

United Provinces, Famine in.
 Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. R Harcourt; *As.* Mr. Buchanan *Dec. 1*, 1252.

India Office

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Viscount Morley. *Under-Secretary*—Rt. Hon. T. R. Buchanan.

Industrial Diseases

Application of Workmen's Compensation Act to—Order Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1758.

Inebriates Acts

Scotland—Inspector's Report Presented, *Nov. 24*, 23, 81.

Ingatestone

Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc.
 Qs. Mr. C. Grant, Earl Winterton, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Forster, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 671.
 Qs. Colonel Lockwood, Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. Wardle, Mr. C. Grant, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 30*, 1081.

Insurance

Illegal Policies, Circular as to.
 Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1673.

International Naval Conference
Parliamentary Consent to Conclusions.
Qs. Mr. Bowles; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 24*, 102.
Powers Invited to take Part in.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 24*, 103.

Ireland
Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.
Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.
Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.
Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.
[*For Particular Places, Estates, etc., see their Names.*]
Agrarian Outrages (1906–8).
Qs. Mr. Barrie; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 407.
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*
Boycotting Statistics.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 374, 407.
Cattle-driving
Police Instructions for dealing with.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 689.
Prison Treatment of Persons unable to furnish Sureties.
Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1100.
Condition of—Report of Mr. Horne.
Q. Mr. Long; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1470.
Constabulary, *see that title.*
Education, *see that title.*
Evictions
Dooley, R., Case of.
Q. Mr. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1275.
Drum, P., Case of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 89.
Fairs and Markets
Regulation of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1471.
Whisky sold at Fairs.
Qs. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 4*, 1763.
Firearms
Outrages in which used.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 406.
Traffic, Regulation of.
Q. Captain Craig, Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Dec. 3*, 1697.
Floods, Measures for preventing.
Q. Mr. Duffy: *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1435.
Home and Cottage Industries, Definition of
Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 131.
Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 25*, 373.

Ireland—*cont.*
Land Acts, Land Commission, Land Judge's Court and Land Purchase, *see those titles.*
Newspapers—Warning as to Publication of certain Resolutions.
Qs. Mr. Barrie; *As* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 408.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell *Dec. 3*, 1689.
Outrages—Cause for failure to report to Police.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 690.
Persons under Police Protection.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 406.
Stationery Office Contracts.
Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1703.
Trade
Fraud, Prevention of—Inspectors appointed.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1701.
Statistics—Agricultural Exports (1897 and 1907.)
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Dec. 2*, 1436.
United Irish League, Activity during 1907.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 686.

Irish Land Bill
Bonus, Effect on Payment of.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 654.
Clauses 3 (2) and (3), Interpretation of.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh; *A.* Mr Hobhouse, *Nov. 30*, 1047.
Clause 44, Effect of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1471.
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. MacCaw; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 696.

Irish Language
Teaching in Schools, Cost of.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 688.

Irish Universities Bill
Charters, Issue of.
Q. Mr. Gwynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 643.

Isle of Ely
Small Holdings Committee, Report of.
Q. Mr. Beck; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 2*, 1430.

Isle of Wight
Coastguard Stations and Duties.
Qs. Mr. Remnant, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 30*, 1069.
Qs. Mr. Godfrey Baring, Mr. Soares, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 1*, 1246.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 2*, 1437.
Qs. Mr. W. F. D. Smith, Mr. A. Lee, Mr. Ashley, *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 2*, 1445.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburghshire]
Tweed River—Crown Fishery Leases granted, *Nov. 25*, 403, 404.

Jarrow
Unemployed, Admiralty Work for.
Q. Mr. Curran; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 2*, 1444.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham]
Admiralty Shipbuilding Contracts, Allocation of, *Dec. 3*, 1661

Joly Estate
Case of Mrs. Killen and Mrs. Hobson.
Q Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 383.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvon, Arfon]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 506; *Nov. 26*, 797–803.

Jordan, Mr J. [Fermanagh, S.]
Vaughan's Charitable School, Administration of, *Nov. 30*, 1050.

Jordan Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1064.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Midland Railway Company Goods Guards, Hours of Duty of, *Nov. 24*, 110.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Coastguard Stations, Reduction of, *Nov. 25*, 414.
Limerick
Labourers' Cottages Schemes, *Dec. 1*, 1269.
Mount St. Vincent Orphanage, Management of, *Nov. 26*, 694.
Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 26*, 696.
Old-Age Pensions—Wife of Man receiving Poor Relief, *Dec. 1*, 1259.

Joynson-Hicks, Mr. [Manchester, N.W.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 503–514.
Lancashire Technical Schools, Delay in Building, *Nov. 24*, 114.

Juvenile Offenders
Consultative Committee to deal with Matters relating to, proposed.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 24*, 109.

Kavanagh, Mr. [Carlow]
Poor Law, Ireland
Deportation of Paupers, System of *Nov. 30*, 1101.
Returns, Cost of Furnishing, *Nov. 30*, 1101.

Kearley, Sir H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Beri-Beri, Report on, *Nov. 26*, 658.
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1216–1218.
Orkney—Copinshay Lighthouse and Fog-Signal, Decision as to, *Nov. 26*, 673.
Railway and Canal Commission, Cost and Work of, *Nov. 26*, 675.
Railway Combines—Tabling of Agreements proposed, *Nov. 26*, 674, 675.
Slate Imports in 1907, *Nov. 26*, 676.
Unemployment Statistics — Comparison with Germany, *Nov. 26*, 675, 676.
United States Unemployment Statistics, Returns as to, *Nov. 26*, 642.

Kekewich, Sir G. W. [Exeter]
Civil Service Boy Clerkships, Examinations for, *Nov. 26*, 679.
Juvenile Offenders, Consultative Committee to deal with Matters relating to proposed, *Nov. 24*, 109.
Merchant Shipping Mates—Board of Trade Examination Fees, *Nov. 24*, 87.
Old-Age Pensions—Filial Contribution through Poor Law Guardians, *Nov. 30*, 1086.
Queen Anne's Bounty—Amalgamation with Ecclesiastical Commission, *Nov. 30*, 1103.

Kenmare Estate
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 643.
Sale Proposals.
Qs. Mr. J. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 412.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devon, Honiton]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill (No. 2), 2R., *Nov. 26*, 783–787.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Ballymachugh Lands, Purchase of, *Dec. 2*, 1443.
Bawnboy Rural District Council—Case of T. Shannon, *Dec. 4*, 1764.

[*cont.*

Kennedy, Mr. V. P.—*cont.*
Cavan
Food and Drugs Act Analyses, *Dec. 1*, 1271.
Untenanted Lands of J. S. Winter and S. Saunderson—Date of Lodgment of Objections, *Nov. 24* 128.
Evictions—Case of P. Drum, *Nov. 24*, 89.
Food and Drugs Act—Administration in Ireland, *Nov. 26*, 645.
Foot-and-Mouth Disease—American Outbreak, *Dec. 1*, 1261.
Land Purchase—Procedure in declaring an Estate, *Dec. 3*, 1698.
Local Government Board Surcharge System, *Dec. 4*, 1764.
O'Connor Estate—Case of Mrs. McCabe, *Nov. 24*, 88.

Kettle, Mr. T. M. [Tyrone, E.]
Education — Intermediate Inspectorate, *Dec. 3*, 1695, 1696.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1174–1178.
Old-Age Pensions
Claims—Estimate of Persons over Seventy, *Dec. 3*, 1633.
Pension Officers, System of appointing, *Nov. 24*, 105.
Regulations, Irish Translation of, *Nov. 24*, 107.
Small Holdings, Calculation of Rent from, *Dec. 3*, 1634.
Unemployment—Irish Applications for Grants and Amount allotted, *Nov. 24*, 129, 130, 132.

Kilbeggan
Cattle-driving Prosecution.
Q. Sir W. Nugent; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 695.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Foot-and-Mouth Disease—American Outbreak, *Dec. 1*, 1262.
Knockmay Malicious Burning Case, *Dec. 3*, 1693.
Land Purchase—Re-sale, Interest payable, etc., *Nov. 30*, 1051.

Kildorrery
Case of J. McGrath.
Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 696.

Kilfinane
Rent Recovery Proceedings.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1274.

Killarney
Fair Rent Appeals, Decisions in.
Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 699.

Killea
Post Office, Sub, Position of.
Q. Mr. C. MacVeigh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 30*, 1102.

Kilmessan
Postal Service with Robinstown.
Qs. Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 3*, 1704.

Kilmurry
Case of Mr. R. J. Walsh.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1052.

Kilrecle
Land Unsold and Condition of District.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1100.

Kilrush
Incendiary Fires on 20th inst.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 646.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]
Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill.
Associations, Formation of, *Dec. 2*, 1465.
Grants—Appeal against Allocation, *Dec. 2*, 1465.
Income-tax, Liability of Patent Royalties, *Nov. 25*, 392.
Richmond Park, Nursery Garden in, *Dec. 2*, 1466.
Weir Charity Scheme, *Dec. 2*, 1468.

Kimberley, Earl of
Small Holdings—Appeal in Cases of Difference as to Valuation, *Dec. 3*, 1619.

King, Mr. A. J. [Cheshire, Knutsford]
Lostock Gralam Railway Level Crossing Accident, *Nov. 25*, 394.
Post Office—Success of Canadian Magazine Post, *Dec. 3*, 1676.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
Indian Army Charges, *Dec. 3*, 1647.

King-Harman Estate
Ballinamuck Portion, Agreements for.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 699.
Turbary Rights.
Q. Mr. James O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1094.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1098.

King's Lynn
Snettisham Farm, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 1*, 1259.

Kingstown
Carlisle Pier, Payment for Use of.
Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 2*, 1473.

Kinnaird, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 853–858.

Knockaderry
Case of Mrs. Browne.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1646.

Knockmay
Burning of Straw, Police Investigation of
Q. Mr. P. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell. *Nov. 25*, 408.
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec.* 3, 1691.

Knox Estate
Case of P. Kilroy.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1097.

Labour Statistics
Abstract (1906–7) Presented, *Dec. 1.* 1229, 1234.

Lamb, Mr. E. H. [Rochester]
Mysore—Position of Converts from Hinduism, *Nov. 30*, 1060.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S.E.]
Education (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 2*, 1505.

Lamington, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 332–336.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 151–153.

Lancashire
Technical Schools, Delay in Building.
Q. Mr. Joynson-Hicks; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24*, 114.

Land (Ireland) Act, 1903
Inspectors, Instructions tc—Copy Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1757.
Section 3, Land Purchased under.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 381.

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896
Joint Holdings, Rents of.
Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1442.

Land Purchase (Ireland)
[*For particular Estates, etc., see their Names.*]
Advances—Returns Presented, *Nov. 27* 827, 934.

Land Purchase (Ireland)—*cont.*
Amount required.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 942.
Bonus—Effect of projected Legislation.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1052.
Estate, Procedure in Declaring.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1698.
Middleman's Lease, Redemption of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1621.
Mortgage of Holding on Purchase and subsequent Eviction, Procedure in Cases of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1268.
Prices
Basis of calculating.
Q. Mr. O'Shea; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 385.
Return (1901–8) Ordered, *Dec. 2*, 1426.
Priority of Cases.
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 694.
Residents in and out of Ireland, Payments to.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 127.
Re-sale—Interests Payable, etc.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1051.
Return as to Valuation, Area, etc., Presented, *Nov. 30*, 1022, 1046.
Sinking Fund, Information as to.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26*, 651.
Sporting Rights, Exercise of.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1689.
Turbary Rights.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1049.

Land Purchase Act, 1891
Section 2, Rules made under.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 382.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash]
Education—Religious Instruction, Teaching of Apostles' Creed, *Dec. 4*, 1758.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 802–807; *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1383; *Dec.* 2, 1490.

Lane Joynt Estate
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 935.

Langley Estate
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1643.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Aliens Act, Administration of—Definition of "Immigrant Ship," etc., *Dec. 2*, 1417.
Army
Strength compared with Three Years ago, *Dec. 3*, 1611.
Territorial Force, Organisation of, *Dec. 3*, 1610.
Business of the House, Course of—Measures to be Passed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 1230; *Dec. 2*, 1418–1422.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 299–314, 342; *Nov. 26*, 615, 620.
Notice of Amendment, *Nov. 24*, 25.

Lansdowne Estate
Case of Mr. D. Whelan.
Qs. Mr. P. Meehan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 404.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
Fiscal Policy of International Trade, Circumstances of Publication of, *Nov. 24*, 103, 104.
Slates—Import Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 111.

Law of Distress Amendment Bill
Rep., *Dec. 3*, 1594.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
Admiralty Purchases of Rum (1906–8), *Dec. 2*, 1444, 1445.
Dangerous Performances on the Stage, Prohibition of, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1083.
North British Railway Employees, Civil Rights of, *Nov. 30*, 1085.
Soldiers — Training for Civil Employment, *Dec. 2*, 1452.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hants, Fareham]
Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Dec. 2*, 1446.
Prevention of Corruption Act, Prosecutions under, *Dec. 1*, 1265.
Rosyth Works—Sunday Labour, *Nov. 30*, 1069.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Natal Natives, Flogging of—Miss Colenso's Letter, *Nov. 24*, 98.

Leigh Estate
Case of E. Egan.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1274.

Leith of Fyvie, Lord
Navy
Docking Accommodation of Vessels of "Dreadnought" Class, *Nov. 24*, 52.
Guns and Gun-Mountings, Provision of, *Nov. 24*, 50.
Policy, Criticisms on, *Nov. 24*, 49–53.
Repairs, Number of Vessels undergoing, *Nov. 24*, 49, 50.
Stores, Reserve of, *Nov. 24*, 51.

Licensing Act, 1904
Loans, Period for Repaying.
Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 3*, 1624.

Licensing Bill
l. 2R, *Nov. 25*, 280; *Nov. 26*, 538; *Nov. 27*, 827.
Debates on Second Reading [Lords], *Nov. 25*, 280; *Nov. 26*, 538; *Nov. 27*, 827.
Bona fide Traveller, Provisions as to, 329, 337, 545, 846.
Children — Exclusion from Public-houses, 329, 337, 353, 545.
Clubs, Provisions dealing with, 295, 302–304, 317, 329, 338–340, 365, 368, 369, 545, 589, 595, 598, 606, 618, 619, 837, 838, 856, 859, 861, 862, 916, 923.
Compensation
Allocation between Owner and Tenant, 294.
Basis of Valuation for, 292, 309, 341, 344, 356–359, 548, 564, 565, 834, 835, 849–851, 854, 855, 873–877, 893, 894, 902–904, 911, 917.
Drunkenness, Statistics as to, 285, 324–326, 347, 544, 921.
Election days, closing of Public-Houses on, 296, 297, 328, 337, 352, 636.
Grocers' Licences, 295, 365, 369, 607, 856, 861, 915.
Licences
Assumption of Right of Renewal, 288, 289, 308, 330, 847, 868, 888.
Number of Reductions under Act of 1904, 286, 305, 331, 354, 364, 543, 553, 585, 586, 596, 620, 621, 832, 848, 861, 910, 926.
Position of Licensed Houses on Expiration of Time-limit, 310.
Licensing Commission, Establishment of, 287, 307, [illegible] 355, 356, 561, 587, 899, 900.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*

Debates on Second Reading [Lords]—*cont.*

Local Option, Proposals for, 287, 291, 292, 317, 360, 361, 577, 631, 911.

Monopoly Value

Definition of, 311, 568.

Resumption by the State, 289, 318, 319, 361, 362, 545, 546, 556, 567, 863, 927, 928.

Off-Licences excluded from Scope of the Bill, 304, 329, 340, 606, 607, 619, 629.

Opening of Public-Houses prior to 8.0 a.m., 328, 329, 636.

Rejection of Measure, 298, 299, 313, 314, 332, 351, 362–364, 370, 597, 602, 603, 605, 613, 623, 624, 625, 632, 840–842, 845, 858, 863, 892, 894, 905, 906, 919, 920, 930.

Share and Debenture Holders, Position of, 290, 312, 320–322, 558, 590–594, 600, 601, 621, 622.

State Inspection of Public-Houses, proposed, 609, 610.

Statutory Reduction of on-Licences, Proposals for, 285, 304, 306, 315, 316, 334, 354, 355, 582, 629, 634, 835, 846, 851, 852, 582, 883, 911, 912, 925–927.

Sunday opening — Curtailment of Hours, 296, 317, 328, 545, 596, 636, 923.

Monmouthshire, Extension of Sunday Closing to, 337, 338.

Temperance, Effect of the Bill on, 543, 544, 551, 552, 554, 562, 563, 573, 595, 615–617, 625, 859, 860, 863, 878, 881, 889, 891, 923.

Time-Limit, Proposals for, 287, 322, 330, 346, 359, 360, 443, 556, 562, 566, 582, 588, 604, 608, 851, 869, 870, 877, 878, 884, 892, 897, 899, 911.

Notice of Amendment (Marquess of Lansdowne), *Nov. 24*, 25.

Lights and Lighthouses

Sites acquired since 1899.

Q. Mr. J. D. White ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1431.

Limerick

Jurors ordered to stand aside.

Q. Mr. J. Roche ; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Dec. 3*, 1703.

Labourers' Cottages Schemes, Inquiry into.

Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1269.

Mount St. Vincent Orphanage, Management of.

Qs. Mr. MacCaw, Mr. Joyce, Mr. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 26*, 693.

Unemployment Grant.

Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 696.

Linlithgow

Polish Miners—Date of Naturalisation.

Q. Sir B. Sheffield ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 670.

Liquor Traffic

Irish Reform Proposals.

Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 381

Liverpool

Chinese Immigration Statistics.

Qs. Mr. Fell ; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 25*, 393.

Port of—Demurrage caused by Shallow Waterways.

Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1674.

Unemployment—Funds of Distress Committee.

Q. Mr. McArthur ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 30*, 1088.

Liverpool, Bishop of

Sunday Labour on Ships lying in Port, *Nov. 30*, 1029.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets Buildings) Bill

*l. Rep**., *Nov. 24*, 2.

3R*., *Nov. 30*, 1021.

c. Lords Amendments *Con.**, *Dec. 2*, 1425.

Lloyd Estate.

Sale Proposals.

Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 691.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Carnarvon Boroughs]

Bank of England Notes not presented for forty years, System of writing off, *Nov. 25*, 392, 393 ; *Nov. 30*, 1078.

Civil Service Pensions

Counting of Unestablished Service, *Nov. 30*, 1077.

New Scheme for, *Nov. 30*, 1058.

Fiscal Policy of International Trade

Circumstances of Preparation of, *Nov. 24*, 104, 105.

Revision before Publication, *Nov. 26*, 650.

Income-Tax

Patent Royalties, Liability of, *Nov. 25*, 392.

Schedule A Valuation for, *Dec. 3*, 1654.

Land Purchase Sinking Fund, Information as to, *Nov. 26*, 651.

Motor Licences issued (1907–8), *Nov. 26*, 658.

Old-Age Pensions

Claims, Information as to, *Nov. 25*, 394 ; *Nov. 30*, 1076.

[*cont.*

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
  Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
    Committees—Payment of Travelling Expenses in certain cases proposed, *Nov. 26*, 650.
    Investigation of Claims, Measures allowed for, *Nov. 24*, 106.
    Married Persons' Income, Method of reckoning, *Nov. 30*, 1046, 1077.
    Pension Officers, System of appointing, *Nov. 24*, 105.
    Poor Relief Disqualification, *Nov. 26*, 653.
    Registers, Access to in Scotland, *Nov. 26*, 653.
    Regulations
      Irish translation, *Nov. 24*, 107; *Nov. 30*, 1077, 1078.
      Scottish translation, *Nov. 24*, 107; *Nov. 30*, 1059.
      Welsh translation proposed, *Nov. 24*, 107.
  Poor Law Returns, Payment of Expense of Furnishing, *Nov. 26*, 652.
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1779, 1780, 1782, 1784, 1786–1792, 1816, 1818–1822.
  Post Office Savings Bank—Financial Position, *Dec. 3*, 1654.
  Railways—Annual Contributions to Exchequer and Local Rates, *Nov. 30*, 1059.
  Taxes—Examinations for Assistant Surveyorships, *Nov. 24*, 88.
  Terminable Annuities—Readjustment System, *Nov. 25*, 393.
  Unemployment—Irish Applications for Grants and Amount allotted, *Nov. 24*, 132.
  Wine Duties—Revision proposed, *Nov. 26*, 652.

Local Authorities
  Loans—Applications under consideration.
    Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 30*, 1088.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
  Auditors, Appointment of
    Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1691.
  Surcharges, Duties as to.
    Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 4*, 1764.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill
  l. Standing Order No. 93 dispensed with, *Nov. 27*, 825.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill
  l. 2R., *Dec. 1*, 1230.

Lochee of Gowrie, Lord
  Navy
    "Capital Ships," Comparative Strength in of Great Britain and Foreign Countries, *Nov. 24*, 44–47.
    Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 24*, 41, 42.
    Two-Power Standard, Definition and Maintenance of, *Nov. 24*, 41, 43–47.
  Private Property at Sea—Protection in Wartime, *Nov. 24*, 48, 49.

Lockwood, Rt. Hon. Lieut.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
  Ingatestone Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc., *Nov. 30*, 1081.
  Mall to Charing Cross Improvement, *Dec. 2*, 1467.
  Naval Volunteer Reserve—Decision as to Signal Rating and Issue of Kits, *Nov. 30*, 1069.
  Rhodesia—Game Destruction in the South, *Nov. 26*, 662, 663.

London
  Municipal Administration — Prosecutions for Corruption.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Sir W. Robson, *Dec. 2*, 1435.

London, Bishop of
  Licensing Bill, 2R, *Nov. 25*, 323–332; *Nov. 26*, 913.

London Electric Supply Bill
  *c. Rep.**, *Nov. 26*, 638.

London (Westminster and Kensington) Electric Supply Companies Bill
  *c. Rep.**, *Nov. 27*, 933.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
  Condition of Ireland—Report of Mr. Horne, *Dec. 2*, 1470.
  Meat Supply, Adequacy of, *Nov. 26*, 681.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
  Armagh Land Purchase Transactions to Date, *Nov. 30*, 1097.
  Ballyogan Firing Outrage, *Dec. 3*, 1697.
  Boycotting Statistics, *Nov. 25*, 374, 407.
  Business of the House, Course of, *Dec. 3*, 1708.
  Cattle-Driving, Police Instructions for dealing with, *Nov. 26*, 689.
  Education Grants in Great Britain and Ireland, *Dec. 2*, 1473.
  Firearms—Outrages in which used, *Nov. 25*, 406.
  Gortdromerillagh Moonlighting Outrage on 19th inst., *Nov. 26*, 692.

[*cont.*

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*
Gurteen Police Patrol, Attack on *Dec. 3*, 1698.
Holycross—Arrest of Persons concerned in Disturbance, *Nov. 26*, 692.
Irish Land Bill, Clause 44, Effect of, Dec. 2, 1471.
Kilrush Incendiary Fires on 20th inst., *Nov. 26*, 646.
Newspapers warned as to Publication of certain Resolutions, *Dec. 3*, 1689.
Outrages in Ireland—Cause for Failure to Report to Police, *Nov. 26*, 690.
Persons under Police Protection, *Nov. 25*, 406.
Riverstown Boycotting Cases, *Nov. 26*, 690.

Lord Chamberlain
Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor
Lord Loreburn.

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor.*

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

"Lord Derby"
Crew of.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1456.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council
Viscount Wolverhampton.

Lord Privy Seal
Earl of Crewe.
Incest Bill, 2R., *Dec. 2*, 1411.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 919–930.

Lostock Gralam
Railway Level Crossing Accident.
Q. Mr. King; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 25*, 394.

Lough, Rt. Hon. T. [Islington, W.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 745–755; *Dec. 1*, 1297, 1384–1386.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1838.

Loughborough
Unemployment—Application for Distress Committee.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1631.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. T. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
[*For Ruling as Speaker, see titles* Speaker *and* Questions.]

Lucas, Lord—*Under-Secretary of State for War.*
Garrisoning of Stations Abroad, Provision for, *Dec. 3*, 1603.
Loan Expenditure, *Dec. 3*, 1605.
Reserve—Strength on Mobilisation, *Dec. 3*, 1601.
Special Reserve, Strength of, *Dec. 3*, 1602.
Strength compared with three years ago, *Dec. 3*, 1601–1604, 1611.

Lunacy
Visitors' Return Presented, *Dec. 3*, 1620.

Lunacy Bill
c. 1R.* *Nov. 24*, 133.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
Kilfirane Rent Recovery Proceedings, *Dec. 1*, 1274.
Lloyd Estate Sale Proposals, *Nov. 26*, 691.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
British Indians in the Transvaal, *Dec. 3*, 1667.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 794.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 230.

Lynch Mr. H. F. B. [Yorkshire, W.R. Ripon].
Oxford Circus—Police Arrangements during Royal Procession, *Nov. 24*, 109.
Persia
  British Government Policy in, *Nov. 26*, 667.
  Constitution, granting of, *Nov. 26*, 666.
  Liakhoff, Colonel, Position of, *Nov. 24*, 100; *Dec. 3*, 1671.
  Russian Government Attitude, *Nov. 24*, 102.

Lyons Estate
Case of Mrs. B. O'Connell.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessey; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 936.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1111; *Dec. 1*, 1335.
  Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1555–1559, 1573, 1576.
  Questions on, *Dec. 2*, 1475.

Lytton, Earl of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 871–887.

Lyveden, Lord
Sunday Labour in Ships lying in Port, *Nov. 30*, 1030.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
- Colwyn Bay Pier, Decision as to, *Dec. 1,* 1236.
- Liverpool Unemployment—Funds of Distress Committee, *Nov. 30,* 1088.
- Port of London Bill, Report Stage—Introduction of new Clause, *Dec. 4,* 1843.
- Roman Catholic Disabilities Bill, Intro, *Nov. 24,* 138–140.
- York, Archbishop of —Ecclesiastical Views of Dr. Lang, *Dec. 3,* 1705.

McCallum, Mr. J. [Paisley]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 208.

McCalmont, Colonel T. [Antrim, E.]
- Carrickfergus, Military Designation of, *Nov. 26,* 658.

McCausland Estate
- Case of Mrs. M. Rice.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3,* 1623.

MacCaw Mr. [Down, W.]
- Irish Land Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 26,* 696.
- Limerick—Management of Mount St. Vincent Orphanage, *Nov. 26,* 693.

McCrae, Sir G. [Edinburgh, E.]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 193.
- House of Commons Galleries, Admission of the Public to, *Dec. 3,* 1707.

Macdonald, Mr. J. A. M. [Falkirk Burghs]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 161–164, 171, 177.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
- Education—Cost of and Grant for Medical Inspection, *Dec. 3,* 1627.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25,* 523–532.
  - Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27,* 963–966, 1013.
  - Children in Attendance—Definition of Term, *Nov. 25,* 402.
  - Clause 2 (5), Tabling of Regulations made under, *Nov. 25,* 403.
  - Grants payable, *Nov. 25,* 400.
- Ingatestone Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc., *Nov. 26,* 672.
- Petrol, Accidents from Explosion of, *Nov. 24,* 109.
- Post Office Christmas Work, Pay for, *Nov. 25,* 371; *Dec. 3,* 1676.
- Walsall Post Office Clerk Prosecuted for Betting, *Dec. 2,* 1460.

McHugh, Mr. P. A [Sligo, N.]
- Gore-Booth Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2,* 1442
- Sligo Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Dec. 2,* 1440.
- Verschoyle Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2,* 1441.
- Wynne Estate—Sale of Hazlewood, *Dec. 2,* 1441.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berkshire, Newbury]
- Berkshire Small Holdings Applications rejected, *Nov. 24,* 123.
- Indian Administrative Reform proposals, *Nov. 24,* 94, 95.; *Dec. 1,* 1248–1250.
- Natal—Dinizulu Case, *Nov. 30,* 1073.
  - Indictment, Tabling of, *Nov. 24,* 98, 99.
- Small Holdings Staff—Additional Appointments proposed, *Nov. 24,* 122.

McKenna, Rt. Hon. R.—*First Lord of the Admiralty* (Monmouthshire, N.)
- Admiralty
  - Flour Contracts—Amount rejected, *Nov. 25,* 378.
  - Rum purchased (1906-8), *Dec. 2,* 1445.
  - Shipbuilding Contracts, Allocation of, *Dec. 3,* 1660, 1661.
  - Timber Contracts—Remedy against default, *Dec. 1,* 1245.
- Anti-Torpedo Destroyer Armament on certain Ships, *Dec. 3,* 1659.
- "Barfleur"—Changes of Captain and Crew, *Dec. 1,* 1246.; *Dec. 3,* 1653.
- "Boadicea" Type Cruisers, Orders for *Dec. 3,* 1658.
- Changing of Officers and Crews, System of, *Nov. 24,* 91, 92.
- Chatham Dockyard Channel—Dredging Proposals, *Nov. 26,* 648.
- Coastguard Inquiry — Proposals as to Report, *Dec. 2,* 1446, 1447.
- Devonport Dockyard Smiths Reinstated Names of, *Nov. 25,* 390.
- Dockyards—Employment Statistics, *Dec. 3,* 1662.
- Engine-room Artificers—Result of Belfast Examination, *Nov. 25,* 372.
- Engineer Officers, *Status* of, *Dec. 1,* 1244, 1245.
- "Gladiator," Disposal of, *Dec. 1,* 1245, 1246.
- Hayti Disturbances—Protection of British Subjects, *Nov. 26,* 649.
- Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Nov. 30,* 1069, 1070; *Dec. 1,* 1247, 1248; *Dec. 2,* 1437, 1445, 1446.
- Jarrow Unemployed, Admiralty work for, *Dec. 2,* 1444.
- Medway Floating Dock Scheme, *Nov. 26,* 649.
- Plans of Campaigns, Officer responsible for, *Nov. 26,* 649.

[*cont.*

McKenna, Rt. Hon. R.—*cont.*
- Portsmouth Dock—Wages paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason, *Nov. 30*, 1067, 1068; *Dec. 2*, 1448, 1449.
- Reserve—Case of A. Rutherford, *Dec. 4*, 1760.
- Rosyth Works—Sunday labour, *Nov. 30*, 1069.
- Shipbuilding
  - Delay, Suggestions for obviating, *Nov. 25*, 388.
  - Speed of Vessels, Proportionate Cost of increasing, *Nov. 24*, 90.
  - Unarmoured Cruisers, Orders for, *Dec. 3*, 1659.
- Stores at Victualling Yards, *Nov. 25*, 390.
- "Superb," Date of completing, *Nov. 25*, 388.
- "Téméraire," Date of completing, *Nov. 25*, 388.
- Torpedo-Boat Destroyers
  - Allocation of Contracts for, *Nov. 24*, 90, 91.
  - Construction—Speed, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1659.
  - Date of Completing, *Nov. 25*, 389.
  - Information as to, *Nov. 26*, 649.
  - Speed of, *Nov. 25*, 389.
  - Trials of proposed purchases, *Dec. 3*, 1660.
- Volunteer Reserve—Decision as to Signal Rating and issue of Kits, *Nov. 30*, 1068, 1069.

McKillop, Mr. W. (Armagh, S.)
- Armagh Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Case of J. Moore, *Nov. 25*, 409.
- Charlemont Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 1*, 1267.
- Poyntzpass Sewerage, Inquiry into, *Dec. 1*, 1267.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Camberwell, N.]
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 463, 514–523.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Agriculture Board—Reconstruction proposed, *Dec. 1*, 1275.
- Foreign Office—Small Wars undertaken against Native Tribes, *Dec. 3*, 1665.
- Holycross Disturbances—Arrest of Suspected Persons, *Dec. 3*, 1695.
- India
  - Administrative Reform Proposals, *Nov. 24*, 95; *Nov. 26*, 660; *Dec. 1*, 1249.
  - Marine Department—Grievances of Clerks, *Nov. 24*, 93.
- Limerick—Management of Mount St. Vincent Orphanage, *Nov. 26*, 694.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S.—*cont.*
- Nigeria, Southern, Military Expedition in, *Dec. 3*, 1665.
- Persia, British Government Policy in, *Nov. 26*, 667.
- Post Office Savings Bank—Fnancial Position, *Dec. 3*, 1654.
- Questions, Imputation in, *Nov. 26*, 694.
- Post Office Savings Bank—Financial Position, *Dec. 3*, 1654.
- Questions, Imputation in, *Nov. 26*, 694.
- Treaties—Parliamentary Control over Ratification, *Nov. 26*, 700, 701.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
- Annalong Harbour Lamps, Responsibility for Lighting, *Nov. 25*, 380.
- Ballyfarnon Cattle-Drive on 11st inst., *Nov. 26*, 697.
- Bank of England Notes not Presented for Forty Years, System of Writing off, *Nov. 25*, 392, 393; *Nov. 30*, 1078.
- Coroners' Inquests, Press Representation at—St. Giles' Case, *Nov. 25*, 394; *Nov. 30*, 1079–1081; *Dec. 3*, 1625.
- Crossgar Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Nov. 25*, 385.
- Dundrum Bay, Illegal Trawling in, *Dec. 3*, 1623.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 206.
- Insurance—Circular as to Illegal Policies, *Dec. 3*, 1673, 1674.
- Liverpool, Port of — Demurrage caused by Shallow Waterways, *Dec. 3*, 1674.
- Old-Age Pension Regulations—Translation into Irish Language, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1077, 1078.
- Outrages—Cause for Failure to Report, *Nov. 26*, 691.

McVeigh, Mr. C. [Donegal, E.]
- Killea Sub-Post Office, Position of, *Nov. 30*, 1102.

Macroom
- Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Cases of Sheehan, Cottar and Twohig.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 413.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
- Army Expenditure of Great Britain and certain Foreign Countries, *Dec. 3*, 1656.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1135, 1203; *Dec. 1*, 1366.
- Railways—Coupling Accidents (1905–6), *Dec. 3*, 1648.

Magistrates
- Threatening Letters received in Ireland.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 687.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
Education in German in Secondary Schools, *Dec. 2*, 1458.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1309–1311, 1368.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 981–984.
Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, Effect on, *Dec. 2*, 1461 ; *Dec. 3*, 1629.
United States Copyright Regulations, *Nov. 25*, 396, 397.

Mall to Charing Cross Improvement
Arches, Erection of.
Qs. Mr. Carr-Gomm, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Rees ; *As.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Dec. 2*, 1467.
Roadway to Birdcage Walk, Widening of.
Q. Mr. Hart-Davies ; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 30*, 1089.

Mallet, Mr. C. E. [Plymouth]
Elementary Education (England and Wales (No. 2.) Bill—Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 991.

Malmesbury, Earl of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 347–350.

Marsham Estate
Case of Mrs. A. McHugh.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1472.

Marston Sicca
Cooper School Scheme.
Q. Mr. Essex ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 3*, 1628.

Martyn Estate
Purchase and Disposal of.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 128.

Maryport
Unemployment Grant.
Q. Sir J. Randles ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24*, 113.

Massey Estate
Untenanted Land, Purchase of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 936.

Massie, Mr. J. [Wiltshire, Cricklade]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 490–493 ; *Dec. 1*, 1351 ; *Dec. 2*, 1489.

Matches
White Phosphorus, Firms using.
Q. Earl of Ronaldshay ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 1*, 1256.

Mayo, Earl of
Sunday Labour on Ships lying in Port, *Nov. 30*, 1028.

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]
Land Purchase—Exercise of Sporting Rights *Dec. 3*, 1689.
Local Government Board Auditors, Appointment of, *Dec. 3*, 1691.
Poor Law Reform Proposals, *Dec. 3*, 1690.
Tullaroan—Postal Facilities at Gaulstown, *Dec. 3*, 1704.
Workhouses—Salaries of Teachers, *Dec. 3*, 1690.

Mearscourt Estate
Case of Mrs. Wynn and Mrs. Winkel.
Q. Sir W. Nugent ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1686.

Meat
Supply, Adequacy of.
Qs. Mr. B. S. Straus, Mr. W. Long ; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 26*, 680.
Trade Combination—Work of Committee.
Q. Mr. Watt ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 1*, 1257.

Meat Marking (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R*, *Nov. 24*, 134.

Meath, Earl of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 906–908.
Merchant Shipping
Officers—Objections to Granting Certificates to Foreigners, *Nov. 24*, 78, 79.
Sunday Labour on Ships lying in Port, *Nov. 30*, 1028.

Meehan, Mr. F. [Leitrim, N.]
Beinn Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 2*, 1439.
Cavan and Leitrim Railway Administration —Inquiry proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1700.
Marsham Estate—Case of Mrs. A. McHugh, *Dec. 2*, 1472.
Montgomery Estate—Case of M. Sweeny, *Nov. 30*, 1060.
Sligo, Leitrim and Northern Counties Railway, Grant to, *Nov. 30*, 1102.
Tottenham Estate—Case of F. McGuinness, *Dec. 1*, 1243.
West Estate—Case of P. D. Kelly, *Nov. 30*, 1094.
White Estate, Sale of, *Dec. 3*, 1646.

Meehan, Mr. P. A. [Queen's County, Leitrim]
Barrow River Drainage Proposals, *Nov. 25*, 405, 410.
Knockmay—Burning of Straw, Police Investigation of, *Nov. 25*, 408.
Lansdowne Estate—Case of Mr. D. Whelan, *Nov. 25*, 404, 405.
Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief Disqualification, *Nov. 26*, 652.

Menzies, Mr. W. [Lanark, S.]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 167–170, 177, 179.
Secondary Schools, Particulars as to, *Nov. 30,* 1093; *Dec. 2,* 1470.

Merchant Shipping
Cunard Line, *see that title.*
Deck Hands—Recommendations of Advisory Committee.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2,* 1456.
Importance of, in time of War.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *Nov. 24,* 69–75.
Mates—Board of Trade Examination Fees.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 24,* 87.
Officers—Objections to granting Certificates to Foreigners.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *Nov. 24,* 69, 72–75, 79; Lord Ellenborough, 75; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 76, 77; Earl of Meath, 78, 79.
Rings and Conferences, Effect of, and Proposals for Legislation.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 27,* 939.
Seamen's Boarding-Houses, Control over.
Q. Mr. Renwick; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2,* 1454.
Subsidies, Conditions of granting—Foreign Systems.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 27,* 937.
Sunday Labour on Ships lying in Port.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *Nov. 30,* 1022–1028; Earl of Mayo, 1028; Earl of Meath, 1028; Bishop of Liverpool, 1029; Lord Lyveden, 1030; Bishop of Bangor, 1030; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 1030–1032; Viscount St. Aldwyn, 1032–1034.

Merchant Shipping Act, 1894
German Ships in British Ports—Order in Council Presented, *Dec. 2,* 1393, 1428.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
Navy
Anti-Torpedo Destroyer Armament on certain Ships, *Dec. 3,* 1659.
Plans of Campaign, Officer responsible for, *Nov. 26,* 649.
Shipbuilding Delay, Suggestions for obviating, *Nov. 25,* 387, 388.
"Superb," Date of completing, *Nov. 25,* 387.
"Téméraire," Date of completing, *Nov. 25,* 387, 388.
Torpedo-Boat Destroyers
Construction—Speed, etc., *Dec. 3,* 1657.
Information as to, *Nov. 26,* 649.
Trials of, *Dec. 3,* 1660.

Midleton, Viscount
Army
Loan Expenditure, *Dec. 3,* 1605, 1609.
Strength compared with three years ago, *Dec. 3,* 1604–1607, 1611.
Education—Medical Inspection of Children, *Dec. 2,* 1404.
Navy
Docking Accommodation for Vessels of "Dreadnought" Class, *Nov. 24,* 62.
Guns and Gun-Mountings, Provision of, *Nov. 24,* 63.
Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 24,* 62–64.

Mildmay, Mr. F. B. [Devon, Totnes]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 1,* 1389–1392; *Dec. 2,* 1476–1480, 1486.
Clause 2 — Right of entry in Single-room Schools, *Dec. 1,* 1260.

Milltown
Disposal of Mr. Fetherston's Ranch.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24,* 126.

Miners
Timber—Value of Welsh Larch.
Qs. Mr. E. Davies, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 1,* 1255.

Mitcham Common
Improvements, Grants for.
Qs. Mr. G. Roberts, Mr. Dobson; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 1,* 1259.

Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W. [Lanark, N. W.]
Cavalry Distribution System, *Nov. 30,* 1070.
Coastguard Inquiry—Proposals as to Report, *Dec. 2,* 1447.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 175, 180, 198, 209.
Fiscal Relations between Foreign Countries and their Colonies, *Dec. 3,* 1679.
Hayti Disturbances—Protection of British Subjects, *Nov. 26,* 649, 663, 664; *Dec. 3,* 1669, 1670.
Scottish Public Meetings—Supply of Lantern Slides, *Nov. 24,* 126.
Sleeping Sickness in Horses, Cure for, *Dec. 3,* 1666.

Monk-Bretton, Lord
Small Holdings—Terms of Loans to Local Authorities, etc., *Dec. 3,* 1619.

Monkswell, Lord
Children Bill, 3R., *Nov. 30,* 1041

Monmouthshire

Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. Thomas Richards; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24,* 124.

Montagu, Mr. E. S. [Cambridgeshire, Chesterton]

Hampshire Small Holdings Applications, Refusals of, *Dec. 1,* 1264.

Montgomery Estate

Case of M. Sweeny.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30,* 1060.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Newry]

Kingstown—Payment for use of Carlisle Pier, *Dec. 2,* 1473, 1474.

North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30,* 1222–1225, 1227.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]

Ballingarry—Land purchased by Mr. H. D. Kenny, *Nov. 24,* 131.

Land Purchase—Priority of Cases, *Nov. 26,* 694.

Pakenham Estate Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *Nov. 24,* 127.

Morrell, Mr. P. [Oxfordshire, Henley]

Hampshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 24,* 121.

Oxfordshire Small Holdings Applications *Nov. 24,* 122.

Small Holdings

Defaulting Counties, Procedure in dealing with, *Nov. 24,* 120.

Delay, Proposals for obviating, *Nov. 24,* 118

Demand for—Duties of Commissioners *Nov. 24,* 123, 124.

Staff—Additional Appointments proposed, *Nov. 24,* 121.

Morrogh Bernard Estate

Case of M. Buckley.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25,* 411.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 158, 180, 206, 217.

North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30,* 1214–1216, 1217, 1224, 1226.

Port of London Bill, *Com., Dec. 4,* 1796–1800, 1816, 1831–1834, 1837.

Motors

Licences issued (1907–8).
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26,* 658.

Mountjoy Prison

Case of R. O'Brien.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26,* 645.

Muldoon, Mr. J. [Wicklow, E.]

Home and Cottage Industries, Definition of, *Nov. 24,* 131; *Nov. 25,* 373.

Mullingar

District Lunatic Asylum Accounts.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26,* 640.

Munster

Land Purchase Prices.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3,* 1693.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]

Education Inspectorships—Appointment projected, *Nov. 25,* 385.

Glenflesk, Railway Station for, proposed, *Nov. 25,* 379.

Kenmare Estate

Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 26,* 643.

Sale Proposals, *Nov. 25,* 412.

Kilmurry—Case of Mr. R. J. Walsh, *Nov. 30.* 1052.

Morrogh Bernard Estate—Case of M. Buckley, *Nov. 25,* 411.

Muskerry, Lord

Merchant Shipping

Importance in time of War, *Nov. 24,* 69–75.

Officers—Objections to granting certificates to Foreigners, *Nov. 24,* 69, 72–75, 79.

Sunday Labour on Ships lying in Port, *Nov. 30,* 1022–1023.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]

Education—Roman Catholic School Attendance, *Dec 2,* 1463.

"Gladiator," Disposal of, *Dec. 1,* 1246.

Port of London Bill, *Com., Dec. 4,* 1818, 1819, 1832, 1841.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]

Education

National School Teachers—Salaries of Assistants, *Nov. 26,* 644; *Dec. 3,* 1645.

Teachers, Irish-trained, Recognition of. *Nov. 26,* 677, 678.

Mountjoy Prison—Case of R. O'Brien, *Nov. 26,* 645.

Napier, Mr. T. B. [Kent, Faversham]

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No 2) Bill, *Com., Nov. 30,* 1197–1200, *Dec. 1,* 1348–1350; *Dec. 2,* 1492–1494; 1533.

Natal
Correspondence as to Trial of certain Natives Presented, *Nov. 30*, 1022, 1045.
Dinizulu Case.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 30*, 1073.
Indictment, Tabling of.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 24*, 98.
Mangena, Mr. A., Case of—Papers Presented, *Nov. 27*, 934; *Dec. 1*, 1229.
Natives, Flogging of—Miss Colenso's Letter.
Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 24*, 98.

Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions Act
Six Orders in Council Presented, *Dec. 2*, 1393, 1427.

Navy
First Lord—Right Hon. R. McKenna.
Financial Secretary.—Dr. T. J. Macnamara.
Anti-Torpedo Destroyer Armament on certain Ships.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 3*, 1659.
"Barfleur"—Changes of Captain and Crew.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec.* 1246.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 3*, 1652.
Battleships, Cost of.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Nov. 24*, 29.
"Boadicea" type Cruisers, Orders for,
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 3*, 1657.
"Capital Ships," Comparative Strength in of Great Britain and Foreign Countries.
Os. Lord Lochee of Gowrie, *Nov. 24*, 44–47.
Changing of Officers and Crews, System of.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 24*, 91.
Chatham Dockyard Channel—Dredging Proposals.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 26*, 648.
Coastguards, *see that title.*
Devonport Dockyard—Names of Smiths re-instated.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 390.
Discipline, Prisons—Rules and Regulations Presented, *Nov. 24*, 23, 81.
Docking Accommodation for Vessels of "Dreadnought" class.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Nov. 24*, 32; Earl of Granard, 36, 65, 68, 69; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 52; Viscount Midleton, 62; Lord Ellenborough, 65–69.

Navy—*cont.*
Dockyard Employment Statistics.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 3*, 1662.
Engine-room Artificers—Result of Belfast Examination.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 372.
Engineer Officers, *Status* of.
Qs. Mr. Bramsdon; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 1*, 1244.
"Gladiator," Disposal of.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Myer; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 1*, 1245.
Guns and Gun-mountings, Provision of.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Nov. 24*, 29; Earl of Granard, 34, 64; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 50; Viscount Midleton, 63.
Home Fleet Manoeuvres, Result of.
Os. Earl of Granard, *Nov. 24*, 64.
Medway Floating Dock Scheme.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 26*, 648.
Plans of Campaigns, Officer responsible for.
Q. Mr. Middlemore; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 26*, 649.
Policy, Criticisms on.
Os. Lord Leith of Fyvie, *Nov. 24*, 49–53.
Portsmouth Lock—Wages paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards, Mr. Bramsdon, Mr. Watt, Mr. C. Grant, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Thorne; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 30*, 1066.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 2*, 1447.
Repairs, Number of Vessels undergoing.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Nov. 24*, 39; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 49, 50.
Reserve—Case of A. Rutherford.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 4*, 1759.
Rosyth
Date of Completion.
Os. Earl of Granard, *Nov. 24*, 36; Marquess of Salisbury, 36.
Sunday Labour.
Qs. Mr. Gulland, Mr. Lee; *As.* McKenna, *Nov. 30*, 1069.
Shipbuilding
Contracts, Method of Allocating, etc.
Qs. Mr. Thorne, Mr. Curran, Mr. Jenkins; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *Dec. 3*, 1660.
Delay, Suggestions for obviating.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 387.

Navy—*cont.*

Shipbuilding—*cont.*

Programme.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Nov. 24*, 25, 28–31; Earl of Granard, 34, 64; Lord Ellenborough 36–40, 65; Lord Lochee of Gowrie, 41, 42; Lord Eversley, 56, 57, 59; Lord Brassey, 60, 61; WViscount idleton, 62–64.

Speed of Vessels, proportionate Cost of increasing.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 24*, 90.

Unarmoured Cruisers, Orders for.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 3*, 1658.

hort Service System, Advantages of.
Os. Lord Eversley, *Nov. 24*, 58.

Stores, Reserve of.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Nov. 24*, 32; Earl of Granard, 35; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 51.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 390.

"Superb"—Date of completing.
Q. Mr. Middlemore; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 387.

"Téméraire"—Date of completing.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 387.

Torpedo-Boat Destroyers

Allocation of Contracts for.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Crean, Mr. Gretton; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 24*, 90.

Construction Policy.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Nov. 24*, 31, 35; Earl of Granard, 35.
Q. Mr. Middlemore; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 3*, 1659.

Date of completing.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 388.

Information as to.
Q. Mr. Middlemore; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 26*, 649.

Speed of.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 25*, 389.

Trials of proposed purchases.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Dec. 3*, 1660.

Two-Power Standard, Definition and Maintenance of.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Nov. 24*, 25–30, 32, 54; Earl of Granard, 34, 36, 65; Lord Lochee of Gowrie, 41. 43–47; Lord Eversley, 53–56; Lord Brassey, 60, 61.

Volunteer Reserve—Decision as to Signal rating and issue of Kits.
Qs. Mr. R. Duncan, Colonel Lockwood; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 30*, 1068.

Navy Estimates

Increase in certain items during last ten years.
Os. Lord Eversley, *Nov. 24*, 57, 58.

Newton, Lord

Business of the House, Course of—Measures to be passed, etc., *Dec. 2*, 1423–1425.

Nicholls, Mr. G. [Northamptonshire, N.]

Burwell Crown Farm, Leasing of, *Nov. 24*, 84.

Coates Small Holdings Applications, *Dec. 2*, 1469.

Old-Age Pensions—Wages, Allocation between Husband and Wife, *Dec. 2*, 1458.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 817–820.

Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1801.

Nigeria

MunshisMilitary Expeditions against.
Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 24*, 99.

Southern—Military Expedition projected
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 3*, 1665.

North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill

c. 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1212.

Nugent, Sir W. R. [Westmeath, S.]

Kilbeggan Cattle-Driving Prosecution, *Nov. 26*, 695.

Mearscourt Estate—Case of Mrs. Wynn and Mrs. Winkel, *Dec. 3*, 1686.

Westmeath

Police, information as to, *Nov. 26*, 694.

Valuation, Cost of, *Dec. 4*, 1762.

O'Brien, Mr. K. E. [Tipperary, Mid]

Holycross Disturbance—Arrest of suspected persons, *Nov. 26*, 646; *Dec. 3*, 1694.

Langley Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Dec. 3*, 1646.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]

Knockmay Malicious Burning Case, *Dec. 3*, 1691.

Railways, State Purchase of—

Estimate of cost, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1686.

Irish Report on, *Nov. 26*, 686.

O'Brien, Mr. W. [Cork]

Cork Barracks, Labour employed on, *Nov. 26*, 653.

Land Purchase Bonus, effect of projected legislation, *Nov. 30*, 1552.

Munster Land Purchase prices, *Dec. 3*, 1694.

Old-Age Pensions—Taxation required in respect of, *Dec. 3*, 1635.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
- Fleetwood Rynd and others, Estate of—Sale Proposals, *Dec. 1*, 1243.
- Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 227–229.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 459–466; *Nov. 30*, 1165–1170.

O'Connor Estate
- Case of Mrs. McCabe.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 88.
- Rents on.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1061.

O'Donnell, Mr. C. J. [Newington, Walworth]
- Education—Roman Catholic School Attendance, *Dec. 2*, 1463.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 809–811.
- Walworth School Grants, *Dec. 2*, 1462.

O'Donnell, Mr. J. [Mayo, S.]
- Begley Estate, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1065.
- Blake Estate
  - Case of Forde, *Dec. 1*, 1237.
  - Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1065.
- Constabulary Cadetships — Nomination System, *Nov. 30*, 1066.
- Domville Estate, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1065.
- Jordon Estate, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1064.
- Robe River Drainage, *Nov. 30*, 1064.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
- Land Purchase
  - Sinking Fund, Information as to, *Nov. 26*, 651.
  - Turbary Rights, *Nov. 30*, 1049.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
- Ballinaraw—Case of R. Foy, *Nov. 30*, 1097.
- Branchfield Farm, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1096.
- Education—Girls' Schools Closed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 1270.
- Knox Estate—Case of P. Kilroy, *Nov. 30*, 1097.
- Riverstone Disturbance on 29th ultimo—Inquiry into Death of J. Stenson, *Nov. 26*, 685.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
- British Indians in the Transvaal, *Dec. 3*, 1668.
- Chiswick Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1631.
- Indian Administrative Reform Proposals, *Dec. 1*, 1248.

O'Grady, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Local Authorities' Loans—Applications under Consideration, *Nov. 30*, 1088.
- Persia
  - Constitution, Granting of, *Nov. 26*, 666.
  - Papers, Tabling of, *Nov. 26*, 667.
- Telegraph Messengers — Conditions of Placing on the Establishment, *Nov. 30*, 1089.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N.]
- Carnacon Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1062.
- King-Harman Estate Turbary Rights, *Nov. 30*, 1094.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
- Knockaderry—Case of Mrs. Browne, *Dec. 3*, 1646.
- Land Purchase—Middleman's Lease, Redemption of, *Dec. 3*, 1621.
- Lane-Joynt Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 27*, 935.
- Lyons Estate—Case of Mrs. B. O'Connell, *Nov. 27*, 936.
- Massey Estate Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *Nov. 27*, 936.
- Shelton Estate, Disposal of, *Nov. 27*, 935.
- Waller Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of *Nov. 27*, 937.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
- Land Purchase Price, basis of calculating, *Nov. 25*, 385.

Old-Age Pensions
- Appeal against rejection, Procedure as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1635.
- Claims, information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 25*, 393.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1076.
- Committees—payment of travelling expenses in certain cases proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rogers; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26*, 650.
- Decision of points of Law—Authority empowered.
  - *Q.* Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1636.
- Filial contribution through Poor Law Guardians.
  - *Qs.* Sir G. Kekewich, Mr. Belloc, Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Cox; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 30*, 1086.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. H. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 1*, 1242.
- Investigation of claims, measures allowed for.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Barnes; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 24*, 106.

[*cont.*

Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
Ireland
Claims—Estimate of persons over Seventy.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1633.

Small Holdings, Calculation of Rent from.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1634.

Law Officers' Opinions, Date of receiving.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1630.

Married Persons' Income, Method of reckoning.
Q. Mr. Fenwick; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1046.
Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1076.

Newspaper publication of lists of claims.
Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 1*, 1254.

Officers
Fines on, for communication to the Press.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. house, *Dec. 3*, 1637.

Pay of.
Q. Mr. Rendall; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1637.

System of appointing.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 24*, 105.

Poor Relief Disqualification.
Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 26*, 647.
Q. Mr. P. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26*, 652.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1651.
Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 3*, 1706.

Husband of Women in receipt of Poor Relief.
Q. Mr. Ashton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 4*, 1762.

Interpretation of certain cases.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 25*, 379.

Position of Pensioners.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 26*, 701.

Wife of person in receipt of Poor Relief.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24*, 113.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Black, Mr. Rogers, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 1*, 1258.
Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1649.

Registers, access to in Scotland.
Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26*, 653.

Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
Regulations
Irish translation of.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 24*, 107.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1077.

Opportunity for discussing.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 24*, 85.

Scottish translation.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 24*, 107.

Welsh translation proposed.
Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 24*. 107.

Translation into Gaelic proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1059.

Taxation required in respect of.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3*, 1635.

Wages—Allocation between Husband and Wife.
Qs. Mr. Nicholls, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 2*, 1458.

Onslow, Earl of—*Chairman of Committees.*
Cattle Importation Restrictions, *Nov. 24*, 23.
Children Bill, 3R., *Nov. 30*, 1039.
Foot and Mouth Disease—American Outbreaks, *Nov. 24*, 24.
Small Holdings—Terms of Loans to Local Authorities, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1612–1615.

Opium
Conference—Opinions of British Delegates.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 3*, 1669.

Orkney
Copinshay Lighthouse and Fog-Signal, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Sir H. Kearley, *Nov. 26*, 673.
North Ronaldshay, Telegraph Extension to, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 30*, 1088.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1674.

Ormathwaite Estate
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1699.

Oxford Circus
Police Arrangements during Royal Procession.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 24*, 109.

Oxford Street
Building Accidents on Waring-White Works.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 1,* 1256.

Oxfordshire
Small Holdings Applications.
Qs. Mr. Morrell, Mr. Bennett; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24,* 122.

Pakenham Estate
Untenanted Land, Disposal of.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24,* 127.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Education—Roman Catholic School Attendance, *Dec. 2,* 1463.
Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill—Formation of Associations, *Dec. 2,* 1466.
Nigerian Nunshis, Military Expeditions against, *Nov. 24,* 99.
Port of London Bill, *Com., Dec. 4,* 1770, 1778–1782, 1790, 1791, 1794, 1800, 1817, 1829, 1836–1838.

Parliament
Allocation of Rooms among Peers, Commons and Press.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Dec. 3,* 1652.
House of Commons
Allocation of Rooms.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 27,* 940.
Galleries, Proposals for Re-opening,
Qs. Sir G. McCrae, Mr. L. Hardy; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *Dec. 3,* 1707.
Strangers, Admission of—Select Committee of Inquiry Appointed, *Dec. 4,* 1844.
House of Lords
Reform—Notice of Resolution (Mr. MacNeill), *Nov. 30,* 1106.
Report from Select Committee Presented, *Dec. 2,* 1394.
Took the Oath—Lord Cranworth, *Nov. 25,* 257.
Reform Proposals.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 3,* 1706.

Parliamentary Election
New Member Sworn—Mr. E. G. Pretyman, for Essex (Chelmsford), *Dec. 3,* 1710.

Pearce, Mr. W. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill—Limitation of Grants, *Dec. 3,* 1635.
Port of London Bill, *Com., Dec. 4,* 1781.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
United States Unemployment Statistics, Returns as to, *Nov. 26,* 642.

Pease, Mr. J. A.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
Business of the House, Course of, *Dec. 3,* 1756.

Penal Servitude Acts
Conditional Licence Granted, *Dec. 2,* 1394, 1428.

Pentonville Road Remand Home
Case of Gertrude Andrews.
Q. Mr. Belloc: *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 1,* 1257.
Cutting of Girl's Hair.
Qs. Mr. Pickersgill; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24,* 115.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26.* 776–781.

Persia
British Government Policy in.
Qs. Mr. Lynch, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov.* 26, 667.
Constitution, Granting of.
Qs. Mr. Dillon, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 26,* 665.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 26,* 666.
Liakhoff, Colonel, Position of.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 24,* 99.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 3,* 1671.
Papers, Tabling of.
Qs. Mr. Dillon, Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 26,* 666.
Parliament, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Hart-Davies; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 24,* 102.
Russian Government Attitude.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 24,* 102.
Russian Officers employed by the Shah.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 26,* 665.
Situation in.
Qs. Mr. Dillon, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 26,* 665.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *Nov. 30,* 1044.
Con. Dec. 2,* 1426.
3R.* *Dec. 4,* 1757.

Petrol
Accidents from Explosion of.
Qs. Mr. A Henderson, Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. P. Barlow; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 24,* 108.
Storage—Use of Safety Devices.
Q. Mr A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 24,* 108.

Phillips, Mr. J. [Longford, S.]

Douglas Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1049.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]

Elementary Education (England and Wales)(No.2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1300–1304.

Pentonville Road Remand Home—Cutting of Girl's Hair, *Nov. 24*, 115, 116.

Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 221.

Unemployment Insurance — German System, *Dec. 2*, 1457.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]

Aberdeen — Railway Carriage of Fish, *Dec. 2*, 1453, 1454.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 156, 163, 164, 173–175, 201, 212–216.

Deputations in connection with, *Nov. 24*, 125.

House of Commons —Allocation of Rooms, *Nov. 27*, 940.

Scottish Sheriff-Substitutes, Solicitors appointed as, *Dec. 3*, 1683.

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill

c. 1R.* *Nov. 25*, 417.
2R. *Dec. 3*, 1710.

Police

Complaints against, System of dealing with.
Qs. Mr. G. Greenwood; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 668.

Poor Law

Ireland

Deportation of Paupers, System of.
Q. Mr. Kavanagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1101.

Reform Proposals.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1690.

Returns, Cost of furnishing.
Q. Mr. Kavanagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1101.

Relief, Expenditure on—Return Presented, *Nov. 30*, 1045.

Returns, Payment of Expense of Furnishing.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26*, 652.

Scottish Out-Relief Payments.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Dec. 1*, 1266.

Poplar

Unemployed, Work for.
Q. Mr. Brooke; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 30*, 1056.

Port of London

Demurrage through shallowness of River at Low Tide.
Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1672.

Port of London Bill

c. *Re-Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1767.
*Rep.** *Dec. 4*, 1844.

Report Stage — Introduction of New Clause.
Os. Mr. McArthur, Mr. Chairman, *Dec. 4*, 1843.

Ports

Use of, and Schemes for improving (United Kingdom and Foreign Countries).
Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1671.

Portumna

Postal Facilities.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 30*, 1103.

Shannon Bridge, Re-building of.
Q. Mr. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1099.

Post Office

Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.

[*See also Names of Places.*]

Baskets—Contracts placed in Scotland.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 1*, 1260.

Canadian Magazine Post, Success of.
Q. Mr. King; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 3*, 1676.

Christmas Work, Pay for.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 25*, 371; *Dec. 3*, 1676.

Hobhouse Report, Result of Classification under.
Q. Mr. Silcock; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 25*, 374.

Newspaper Rates to and from Australia.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 2*, 1437.

Postmasters — Licensed Publicans Appointed in Ireland.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 25*, 398.

Postmen, Auxiliary, in City, Pay of.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 1*, 1260.

Post Office Consolidation Bill

l. 3R.* *Nov. 24*, 23.

c. 1R.* *Nov. 27*, 943.

Post Office Savings Bank

Financial Position.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Dec. 3*, 1654.

Potts Estate
Situation on.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 25*, 384.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1136; *Dec. 1*, 1304, 1333, 1338; *Dec. 2*, 1532.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 972–975.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Carrick-on-Suir Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Arbitrators' Charges, *Dec. 4*, 1763.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1136.

Poyntzpass
Sewerage, Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1267.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon. W. Runciman.

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill.

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Preston
Mission Shelter—Case of W. Walsh.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 26*, 640.

Prevention of Corruption Act
Prosecutions under.
Qs. Mr. Renton, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Sir W. Robson, *Dec. 1*, 1265.

Prevention of Crime Bill
c. Con., *Nov. 24*, 221.
Suspension of Eleven o'clock Rule *Motion* (Mr. Asquith), *Nov. 24*, 144.

Price, C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
Old-Age Pensions—Access to Registers in Scotland, *Nov. 26*, 653.

Private Property at Sea
Protection in Wartime.
Os. Lord Lochee of Gowrie, *Nov. 24*, 48, 49.

Public Accounts Committee
Report, Time for Discussion of.
Qs. Earl Winterton; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 26*, 700.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Act
Scotland—Regulations as to Unsound Food and Foreign Meat, Presented, *Dec. 1*, 1234, 1235; *Dec. 2*, 1394.

Queen Anne's Bounty
Amalgamation with Ecclesiastical Commission, Scheme for.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 30*, 1103.

Questions
Circulation of Answer with the Votes, Procedure in.
Os. Mr. James Hope, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Runciman, *Dec. 4*, 1766.
Friday, Procedure in asking on.
Qs. Mr. C. Grant; *As.* Mr. Speaker *Nov. 27*, 943.
Imputation in.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 26*, 694.
Irrelevant, *Dec. 2*, 1458; *Dec. 3*, 1662.
Notice to be given of, *Nov. 24*, 124; *Nov. 30*, 1080; *Dec. 3*, 1698.
Out of Order, *Nov. 24*, 104, 121; *Dec. 3*, 1663, 1664, 1703.
Statements in, Responsibility for, *Nov. 26*, 697.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1287, 1373–1375.
Hay and Straw, Power of Agriculture Department to Prohibit Landing of, *Nov. 25*, 379.

Railway and Canal Commission
Cost and Work of.
Q. Mr. Wardle; *A.* Sir H. Kearley, *Nov. 26*, 675.

Railways
Annual Contributions to Exchequer and Local Rates.
Q. Mr. A. Chamberlain; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 30*, 1058.
Combines—Tabling of Agreements proposed.
Qs. Mr. Wardle, Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir H. Kearley, *Nov. 26*, 673.
Contributions by Companies to certain Associations.
Q. Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1673.
Coupling Accidents (1905–6).
Q. Mr. Maddison; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1648.
Hours of Labour—Return Presented, *Dec. 2*, 1426; *Dec. 3*, 1593.

[*cont*

Railways—*cont.*
Irish
Cattle Transit Arrangements.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Dec. 3*, 1648.
Lodging-houses Provided for Guards, etc., State of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 30*, 1054.
Midland Great Western—Hours of Duty of Firemen, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 30*, 1054.
State Purchase in
Estimate of Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1686.
Report on.
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 686.
Midland Company Goods Guards, Hours of Duty of.
Qs. Mr. Jowett, Mr. Clynes; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 24*, 110.
North British Employees, Civil Rights of.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 30*, 1084.

Rainy, Mr. A. R. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 195.

Ramsey
Sanitary Condition.
Q. Mr. Boulton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 26*, 639.

Randles, Sir J. S. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
Cockermouth—Disfranchisement of Unemployed Persons, *Nov. 24*, 113.
Maryport Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 24*, 113.
Workington Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 24*, 113.

Rathdowney
Petty Sessions—Case of P. Sweeny.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1063.

Rawlinson, Mr J. F. P. [Cambridge University
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1313–1316; *Dec. 2*, 1516, 1534.
Effect on Attendance, *Dec. 1*, 1236.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 223, 224, 231–233.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1782.

Records, Public
Colonial Office (New Zealand Company) —List of Documents of not Sufficient Value to justify Preservation Presented, *Nov. 26*, 537, 639.

Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]
Evictions—Case of R. Dooley, *Dec. 1*, 1275.
Portumna—Re-building of Shannon Bridge, *Nov. 30*, 1099.
Rosse Estate—Case of R. Egan, *Dec. 2*, 1472.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1107, 1161.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1548–1555, 1567, 1569, 1570.
Workhouse Teachers, Salaries of, *Dec. 3*, 1698.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
Clare
Labourers' Cottages erected, *Nov. 26*, 691.
Land, Price of, *Nov. 26*, 689.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1178–1185.
Ennis Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 24*, 130.
Martyn Estate, Purchase and Disposal of, *Nov. 24*, 128.
Roman Catholic Disabilities Bill, Intro., *Nov. 24*, 134–138.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
Afghanistan—Prevention of Gun-running, *Dec. 1*, 1254.
British Indians in the Transvaal, *Dec. 3*, 1667.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1170; *Dec. 1*, 1355–1357; *Dec. 2*, 1522, 1523.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 1008.
India
Anarchist Outrages, Proposals for dealing with, *Dec. 3*, 1662.
Calcutta—House Accommodation for Government Officials, *Dec. 1*, 1251, 1252.
Clough, Mr., and Mr. Hume, Information as to, *Dec. 1*, 1250.
Coconada—Cost of Extra Police, *Nov. 26*, 661, 662.
Education Policy, *Nov. 26*, 661.
Jhansi—Sentence on Brahmin for tampering with Troops, *Dec. 3*, 1663.
Labour Agencies, Government Assistance to, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 661.

[*cont.*

Rees, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
Malarial Fever, Prevalence of, *Dec. 1,* 1251.
Seditious Literature sent through French Colonies, *Dec. 1,* 1251.
United Provinces, Famine in, *Dec. 1,* 1252.
Mall to Charing Cross Improvement, *Dec. 2,* 1467.
Mine Timber—Use of Welsh Larch, *Dec. 1,* 1255.
Persia, Situation in, *Nov. 26,* 665.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3,* 1717.
Railway Combines—Tabling of Agreements proposed, *Nov. 26,* 674.
Wine Duties Revision proposed, *Nov. 26,* 652.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Nov. 30,* 1069.

Rendall, Mr. A. [Gloucestershire, Thornbury]
Census of Production — Agriculture Returns, *Dec. 3,* 1636.
Old-Age Pension Officers, Pay of, *Dec. 3,* 1637.

Renton, Mr. L. [Lincolnshire, Gainsborough]
Prevention of Corruption Act, Prosecutions under, *Dec. 1,* 1265.
Prevention of Crime Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 24,* 221–223, 225.
Taximeter Cabs—Privileges at Railway Stations, *Nov. 26,* 642.

Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4,* 1792, 1803, 1808, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1839.
Seamen's Boarding-houses, Control over. *Dec. 2,* 1454.

Rhodesia
Game Destruction in the South.
Qs. Colonel Lockwood; *As.* Colone Seely, *Nov. 26,* 662.

Rhue Rhea
Lighthouse and Fog-Signal for.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 1,* 1237.

Ribblesdale, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25,* 314–323.

Richards, Mr. T. [Monmouthshire, W.]
Monmouthshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 24,* 124.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
Admiralty Flour Contracts—Amount Rejected, *Nov. 25,* 377.
Agriculture and Fisheries Board
  Constitution, Pay and Number of Meetings of, *Nov. 26,* 683.
  Meeting to Consider Expediting of Small Holdings Business, proposed, *Nov. 30,* 1093.
  Reconstruction of, *Dec. 1,* 1275.
Aldridge Colliery, Accidents at, *Nov. 26,* 641.
Hollow Ware, Lead used in Lining, *Nov. 26,* 669, 670.
Navy
  Devonport Dockyard, Smiths Reinstated, Names of, *Nov. 25,* 390.
  Dockyard Employment Statistics, *Dec. 3,* 1662.
  Lock at Portsmouth—Wages Paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason, *Nov. 30,* 1066, 1067; *Dec. 2,* 1447, 1448.
  Stores at Victualling Yards, *Nov. 25,* 390.
Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief Disqualification, Position of Pensioners, *Nov. 26,* 701.
Small Holdings
  Commissioners, Number, Pay and Duties of, *Nov. 26,* 683.
  Demand for—Duties of Commissioners *Nov. 24,* 124.
  Staff—Additional Appointments, proposed, *Nov. 24,* 123.
Soldiers—Instruction in Boot-making, *Dec. 2,* 1451.
Staffordshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 24,* 122.
Stoke-on-Trent Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3,* 1632.
War Office Boot Contracts (1898–1902), *Dec. 3,* 1640.

Richardson, Mr. A. [Nottingham, S.]
Sherwood Foresters, Seventh Battalion, Uniform, etc. of, *Nov. 24,* 92, 93.

Richmond Park
Nursery Garden, Formation of.
Qs. Sir H. Kimber, Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Dec. 2,* 1466.

Ridley, Viscount
Aliens Act Administration—Definition of "Immigrant Ship," etc., *Dec. 2,* 1416.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27,* 890–894.

Rivers Pollution Prevention Act
Scotland—Report Presented, *Nov. 24,* 23, 81

Riverstown
Boycotting Cases.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 690.
Disturbance on 29th ult.—Inquiry into Death of J. Stenson.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 685.
United Irish League Intimidation Prosecution.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 687.

Robe River
Drainage of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1064.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 768–775; *Com., Dec. 2*, 1494.
Folkestone Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1632.
Grangemouth Dock Labour Dispute, *Dec. 3*, 1625.
Irish Stationery Office Contracts, *Dec. 3*, 1703.
King's Lynn—Disposal of Snettisham Farm, *Dec. 1*, 1259.
Mitcham Common Improvements, Grant for, *Dec. 1*, 1259
Wavertree—Premises used in Paying Poor Relief, *Dec. 3*, 1629.

Robertson, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 572–578, 624.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
British Indians in the Transvaal, Position of, *Nov. 25*, 391.
Ghandi, Mr., Case of, *Nov. 30*, 1072.

Robinson, Mr. S. [Brecknock]
Hong Kong Riots on 2nd ult., *Dec. 3*, 1668.

Robson, Sir W. S.—*Attorney-General* [South Shields]
Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1754, 1755.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 1*, 1341–1343, 1368, 1372, 1387, 1388; *Dec. 2*, 1480–1482, 1484, 1488, 1515–1521.
London Municipal Administration—Prosecutions for Corruption, *Dec. 2*, 1435.
Prevention of Corruption Act, Prosecutions under, *Dec. 1*, 1265, 1266.

Roch, Mr. W. [Galway, E.]
Welsh Trade Statistics, Publication of, *Nov. 24*, 113.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
Galway—Police Protection of Mr. Lewis, *Nov. 30*, 1051.
Gurteen—Case of M. Finnerty, *Dec. 3*, 1703.
Limerick Jurors Ordered to Stand Aside, *Dec. 3*, 1703.
Portumna Postal Facilities, *Nov. 30*, 1103.

Rogers, Mr. F. N. [Wiltshire, Devizes]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Vacant Farms, Offer of, for Small Holdings *Dec. 3*, 1682.
Old-Age Pensions
Committees — Payment of Travelling Expenses in Certain Cases, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 650.
Married Persons' Income, Method of Reckoning, *Nov. 30*, 1076.
Poor Relief Disqualification, *Nov. 26*, 647; *Dec. 3*, 1706.
Wife of Man Receiving Poor Relief, *Dec. 1*, 1258.
Small Holdings
Commissioners of Woods and Forests, Offer of Vacant Farms by, *Nov. 30*, 1093.
Delay, Proposals for Obviating, *Nov. 24*, 117.
Persons Willing to Move Elsewhere, Holdings for, *Nov. 24*, 118.

Roman Catholic Disabilities Bill
c. Intro., *Nov. 24*, 134.
1R.* *Nov. 24*, 143.

Ronaldshay, Lord [Middlesex, Hornsey]
Admiralty Timber Contracts — Remedy against Default, *Dec. 1*, 1245.
Civil Service—Second Division Clerks Salaries, *Dec. 1*, 1265.
Matches—Use of White Phosphorus, *Dec. 1*, 1256.
White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill, *Com., Dec. 3*, 1746, 1751–1753.

Roscommon
Agricultural and Technical Committee, Allegations Against.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Dec. 1*, 1239.
Old-Age Pension Case of T. Conboy.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1269.

Rosebery, Earl of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 560–572; *Nov. 27*, 918.

Rosse Estate
Case of R. Egan.
Q. Mr. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1472.

Rosyth Naval Base
See under Navy.

Roumania
Jews, Position of.
Q. Mr. S. Samuel; *A.* Mr. McKinnon Wood, *Nov. 25*, 391.

Rowlands, Mr. J. [Kent, Dartford]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1793, 1814, 1820.

Runciman, Rt. Hon. W.—*President of the Board of Education* [Dewsbury]
Accommodation and Attendance Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 86.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 417–431, 433, 479, 484, 497, 506, 527; *Nov. 26*, 740, 752, 792, 795; *Nov. 30*, 1108, 1112, 1120, 1126, 1131, 1132, 1161–1165, 1189, 1195; *Dec. 1*, 1319, 1328–1330, 1336, 1338, 1361, 1362, 1373, 1381, 1384, 1389; *Dec. 2*, 1506.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 1002.
Attendance, Effect on, *Dec. 1*, 1236.
Clause 1 (3)—Application of Exception, *Dec. 3*, 1678.
Clause 2 (5), Tabling of Regulations made under, *Nov. 24*, 85.
Contracted-out Schools, *Dec. 4*, 1763.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1549, 1554, 1567–1580, 1583, 1584.
Grants, Allocation of, *Dec. 4*, 1760.
Schoolhouse, Definition of, *Dec. 3*, 1628.
Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, Position of, *Dec. 3*, 1629.
Teachers, Position of, *Dec. 3*, 1678.
Expenditure (1906–7), *Dec. 3*, 1628.
Marston Sicca—Cooper School Scheme, *Dec. 3*, 1628.
Medical Inspection, Cost of and Grant for, *Dec. 3*, 1629.
Question—Circulation of Answer with the Votes, *Dec. 4*, 1766.
Religious Instruction—Teaching of Apostles' Creed, *Dec. 4*, 1758.
Teachers' Salaries, Expenditure on, *Dec. 4*, 1760.

Russell, Earl
Children Bill, 3R., *Nov. 30*, 1040.
Incest Bill, 2R., *Dec. 2*, 1410.

Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.—*Vice-President of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department* [Tyrone, S.]
Agricultural Exports, (1897 and 1907), *Dec. 2*, 1437.
Glenflesk, Railway Station for, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 379.

Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.—*cont.*
Hay and Straw, Power to prohibit landing of, *Nov. 25*, 380.
Home and Cottage Industries, Definition of, *Nov. 25*, 373.
Railways—Cattle Transit Arrangements, *Dec. 3*, 1648.
Roscommon Agricultural and Technical Committee, Allegations against, *Dec. 1*, 1239.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
British Indians in the Transvaal, *Dec. 3*, 1666, 1667.
Egyptian Provincial Councils — Draft Decree for Amendment of Constitution, *Nov. 24*, 101.
Indian Administrative Reform Proposals, *Nov. 26*, 660; *Dec. 1*, 1248, 1249.
Persia—Position of Colonel Liakhoff, *Nov 24*, 99, 100.

Rutherford, Mr. W. H. [Liverpool, W. Derby]
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1225, 1227.

St. Albans, Bishop of
Incest Bill, 2R., *Dec. 2*, 1408.

St. Aldwyn, Viscount
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 351–364.
Sunday Labour on Ships lying in Port, *Nov. 30*, 1032–1034.

St. David's, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*. 336–346.

Salisbury, Bishop of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 370.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Rosyth Works—Date of Completion, *Nov. 24*, 36.

Salt
Colonial and Foreign Import Duties.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1429.

Salvation Army
Registration of.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 27*, 939

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1710–1713, 1716, 1720, 1722, 1738, 1740–1744.

Samuel, Mr. S. M. [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Roumanian Jews, Position of, *Nov. 25*, 391.

Saurin Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2,* 1471.

Science, Royal College of
Teaching Staff, Effect of Transfer on Income of.
Qs. Mr. Gwynn; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 30,* 1090.

Scotland
Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
Depute-Sheriff Clerks, Position of.
Q. Mr. Sutherland; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Dec. 3,* 1684.
Public Meetings—Supply of Lantern Slides.
Q. Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, *Nov. 24,* 126.
Roads and Bridges, Rate Levied for—Return Presented, *Dec. 4,* 1757.
Sheriffs' Clerks, Allowances to.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 2,* 1467.
Sheriff-Substitutes, Solicitors Appointed as.
Qs. Mr. Watt, Mr. Pirie; *As.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Dec. 3,* 1682.

Scott, Mr. A. H. [Ashton-under-Lyne]
British Indians in the Transvaal, *Dec. 3* 1667.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R, *Dec. 3,* 1719.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H. [Lambeth, Brixton]
Port of London Bill, *Com., Dec. 4,* 1810.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

retary of State for India
Rt. Hon. Viscount Morley.

Secretary of State for Scotland
Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seddon, Mr. J. R. [Lancashire, N.W., Newton]
White Phosphorous Matches Prohibition Bill, *Con., Dec. 3,* 1752.

Seely, Colonel—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Liverpool, Abercromby]
Africa, East—Sick Leave of Officials, *Nov. 27,* 937.
Africa, South—Visit of Naval Squadron to—Farewell Message of Admiral, *Nov. 25,* 389, 390.
British Indians in the Transvaal, Position of, *Nov. 25,* 391; *Dec. 3,* 1666, 1667, 1668, 1669.
Ghandi, Mr., Case of, *Nov. 30,* 1072, 1073.
Canadian Immigration Laws, *Nov. 30,* 1072.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company—Treatment of Glasgow Boilermakers *Dec. 2,* 1452.
Ceylon Tea-cess, Collection of, *Dec. 4,* 1761.
Hong Kong Riots on 2nd ult., *Dec. 3,* 1668.
Immigration Rules in the Colonies, *Nov. 24,* 95, 96; *Nov. 30,* 1073; *Dec. 3,* 1666.
Natal
Dinizulu Case, *Nov. 30,* 1073.
Indictment, Tabling of, *Nov. 24,* 98, 99.
Natives, Flogging of—Miss Colenso's Letter, *Nov. 24,* 98.
Nigeria
Munshis, Military Expeditions against *Nov. 24,* 99.
Southern—Military Expedition projected, *Dec. 3,* 1665.
Rhodesia—Game Destruction in the South, *Nov. 26,* 663.
Sleeping Sickness in Horses, Cure for, *Dec. 3,* 1666.
Trinidad
Couva water Rate, Memorial as to, *Nov. 24,* 97.
Immigration Ordinance (Section 70) Evasion of, alleged, *Nov. 24,* 97, 98.

Servia
Parcels Post Arrangements.
Q. Mr. B. S. Straus; *A.* Mr. Buxton *Dec. 3,* 1653.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
Deputy-Sheriff Clerks, Position of, *Dec. 3,* 1684.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 195, 211.
Sheriff-substitutes, Solicitors appointed as, *Dec. 3,* 1682, 1683.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.]
Macroom Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Cases of Sheehan, Cottar and Twohig *Nov. 25,* 413.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, S.]

Cashel Disturbance on 23rd ult., *Dec. 1*, 1273.

Edenderry Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Dec. 3*, 1687.

Kilmessan and Robinstown Postal Service, *Dec. 3*, 1704, 1705.

Sheffield, Sir B. [Lincolnshire, Brigg]

Education (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 2*, 1513.

Furniture of Contracting-out Schools, *Nov. 26*, 678.

Linlithgow Polish Miners—Date of Naturalisation, *Nov. 26*, 670.

Shelton Estate

Untenanted Lands, Disposal of.

Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 935.

Shop Hours Act

Orders under, Presented, *Nov. 26*, 537, 639.

Sigginshaggard

Evicted Tenants, Position of.

Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1048.

Silcock, Mr. T. B. [Somerset, Wells]

Post Office—Result of Classification under Hobhouse Report, *Nov. 25*, 374.

Somersetshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 25*, 375.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]

Clyde Foreshores above Greenock, Valuation of, *Nov. 25*, 376.

Education—Particulars as to Secondary Schools, *Nov. 30*, 1094; *Dec. 2*, 1470.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 147, 151, 154, 157, 170–173, 175, 179, 181, 182, 183, 185–188, 192, 194, 196–198, 202, 203, 209, 210.

Deputations in Connection with, *Nov. 24*, 125.

Fisheries—New Cruiser, *Dec. 1*, 1237.

Glasgow Young Men's Christian Association Classes, Position of, *Dec. 1*, 1266.

North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1222, 1223, 1225.

Poor Law—Out-relief Payments, *Dec. 1*, 1266.

Slates

Import Statistics.

Qs. Mr. Tomkinson, Mr. B. Law, Mr. E. Davies; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 24*, 111.

Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Sir H. Kearley, *Nov. 26*, 676.

Sleeping Sickness

Horses, Cure for.

Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Dec. 3*, 1666.

Sligo

Evicted Tenants, Position of.

Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1440.

Sligo, Leitrim and Northern Counties Railway

Grant to.

Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 30*, 1102.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]

Ingatestone Election Disturbance, *Nov. 30*, 1082.

Naval Engine-room Artificers—Result of Belfast Examination, *Nov. 25*, 372.

Small Holdings

[*See also Names of Counties and Places.*]

Commissioners, Number, Pay and Duties of.

Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 26*, 683.

Commissioners of Woods and Forests, Offer of Vacant Farms by.

Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 30*, 1093.

Co-operation, Encouragement of.

Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 119.

Co-operative Societies, Land held by.

Q. Mr. J. Collings; *A.* Mr. Fuller, *Dec. 3*, 1678.

Counties which have not Submitted Schemes.

Q. Mr. R. Harcourt; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 119.

Defaulting Counties, Procedure in dealing with.

Qs. Mr. R. Harcourt, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 119.

Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Dec. 1*, 1263.

Delay, Proposals for Obviating.

Q. Mr. Rogers, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 117.

Demand for—Duties of Commissioners.

Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 123.

Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 24*, 124.

Loans to Local Authorities, Terms of.

Os. Earl of Onslow, *Dec. 3*, 1612–1615; Earl Carrington, 1615–1619; Lord Monk-Bretton, 1619.

Names of Applicants, Practice of Furnishing to Private Landowners.

Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 26*, 684.

Persons willing to Move elsewhere, Holdings for.

Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 118.

[*cont.*

Small Holdings—*cont.*
Rent, Basis of Calculating.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 26*, 655.
Staff—Additional Appointments proposed.
Qs. Mr. Morrell, Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 121.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 123.
Valuation, Appeal in Cases of Difference as to.
Qs. Earl of Kimberley, *Dec. 3*, 1619; Earl Carrington, 1620.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
Dogs, Stray—Disposal of, *Nov. 24*, 107, 108.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 194.
Hampshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 24*, 120, 121.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1125–1127, 1187–1191; *Dec. 1*, 1276–1279.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1712.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]
Coast Committee Report, Proposals as to, *Dec. 2*, 1446.
Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Dec. 2*, 1445.

Snowden Mr. P. [Blackburn]
Old-Age Pensions
Appeal against Rejection, Procedure as to, *Dec. 3*, 1635.
Decision of Points of Law, *Dec. 3*, 1636.
Fines on Officials for Communications to the Press, *Dec. 3*, 1637.
Law Officers' Opinions, Date of Receiving, *Dec. 3*, 1630.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devon, Barnstaple]
Birstall—John Bass Charity, *Dec. 1*, 1240.
Isle of Wight Coastguard, *Dec. 1*, 1247, 1248.
Weir Charity Scheme, *Dec. 2*, 1468, 1469.

Solicitor-General
Sir S. T. Evans.

Solicitor General for Ireland
Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
Mr. A. Ure.

Somersetshire
Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. Silcock; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 25*, 375.

Soudan
Lado Enclave
Destruction of Elephants.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 3*, 1670.
Position in.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 30*, 1074.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 30*, 1104.
Wild Game, Preservation of.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Dec. 3*, 1670.

Southwark, Bishop of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 27*, 863–871.

Southwick-on-Weir
Distress in.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24*, 86; *Dec. 1*, 1241.

"Spartan Prince"
Loss, Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 3*, 1621.

Speaker
Business of the House, Course of, *Dec. 3*, 1709.
Education (Scotland) Bill
Amendment Involving Fresh Charge was not in Order, *Nov. 24*, 148, 149.
Amendments out of Order, *Nov. 24*, 161, 182, 200.
Division could not be taken without Discussion, *Nov. 24*, 161.
Irrelevant Matter, *Nov. 24*, 174.
School Board Elections, Interpretation of Clause as to, *Nov. 24*, 201.
Time Allotted to, *Nov. 24*, 163, 164.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill—Instructions to Committee out of Order, *Nov. 30*, 1106.
House of Commons Galleries, Admission of the Public to, *Dec. 3*, 1707.
Insinuations as to Motives of Members was not in Order, *Nov. 30*, 1227, 1228.
Prevention of Crime Bill—New Clause out of Order, *Nov. 24*, 222.
Questions, *see that title.*

Spicer, Sir A. [Hackney, Central]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1808.

Staffordshire
Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 24*, 122.

Statistical Abstract
Foreign Countries (1896–1906)—Copy Presented, *Dec. 2*, 1426; *Dec. 3*, 1593.

Statute Law Revision Bill
- Report from Joint Committee, *Dec. 2,* 1394, 1475.

Staveley-Hill, Mr. H. [Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
- Prevention of Crime Bill, *Con., Nov. 24,* 226.

Stoke-on-Trent
- Distress Committee, Sanction to.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24,* 83.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3,* 1632.
- Fenton Electric Supply, Loan for.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24,* 83.

Strachey, Sir E.—*Treasurer of the Household* [Somerset, S.]
- Agriculture and Fisheries Board
  - Constitution, Pay and Number of Meetings of, *Nov. 26,* 683, 684.
  - Meeting to Consider Expediting of Small Holdings Business, proposed, *Nov. 30,* 1093.
- Berkshire Small Holdings Applications Rejected, *Nov. 24,* 123.
- Burwell Crown Farm, Leasing of, *Nov. 24,* 84, 85.
- Cattle Import Statistics, etc., *Dec. 1,* 1263.
- Coates Small Holdings Applications, *Dec. 2,* 1469.
- Foot-and-Mouth Disease — American Outbreak, *Nov. 25,* 404; *Dec. 1,* 1261, 1262; *Dec. 2,* 1430.
- Gooseberry Mildew—Fungicides used, *Nov. 30,* 1055.
- Hampshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 24,* 120, 121; *Nov. 26,* 682, 683; *Dec. 1,* 1264, 1265.
- Hop Industry—Select Committee Recommendations, *Dec. 1,* 1242.
- Isle of Ely Small Holdings Committee, Report of, *Dec. 2,* 1430.
- Meat Supply, Adequacy of, *Nov. 26,* 681.
- Monmouthshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 24,* 124.
- Old-Age Pension Claims, Newspaper Publication of, *Dec. 1,* 1254.
- Oxfordshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 24,* 122, 123.
- Small Holdings
  - Commissioners, Number, Pay and Duties of, *Nov. 26,* 683.
  - Commissioners of Woods and Forests, Offer of Vacant Farms by, *Nov. 30,* 1093.
  - Co-operation, Encouragement of, *Nov. 24,* 119.
  - Counties which have not Submitted Schemes, *Nov. 24,* 119.

Strachey, Sir E.—*cont.*
- Small Holdings—*cont.*
  - Defaulting Counties, Procedure in Dealing with, *Nov. 24,* 120; *Dec. 1,* 1264.
  - Demand for—Duties of Commissioners, *Nov. 24,* 123, 124.
  - Delay, Proposals for Obviating, *Nov. 24,* 118.
  - Names of Applicants, Practice of Furnishing to Private Landowners, *Nov. 26,* 684.
  - Persons Willing to Move elsewhere, Holdings for, *Nov. 24,* 118.
  - Rent, Basis of Calculating, *Nov. 26,* 655.
  - Staff—Additional Appointments proposed, *Nov. 24,* 121, 122, 123.
- Somersetshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 25,* 377.
- Staffordshire Small Holdings Applications *Nov. 24,* 122.
- Surrey Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 25,* 374.

Straus, Mr. B. S. [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]
- Meat Supply, Adequacy of, *Nov. 26,* 680, 681.
- Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3* 1733–1736.
- Servia—Parcel Post Arrangements, *Dec. 3,* 1653.

Streatham
- Weir Charity, *see under* Charities.

Stretton Sugwas
- Subpostmaster, Prosecution of
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 25,* 397.

"Strombus"
- Inquiry into Deaths of Asiatics.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2,* 1457.

Stuart, Mr. J. [Sunderland]
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Nov. 30,* 1137, 1185–1187.

Summary Jurisdiction [Scotland] Bill
- c. *Rep.* Dec. 3,* 1710.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
- Brentford Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3,* 1632.
- Coastguard—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 24,* 117.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 1,* 1320–1322.
- Harrogate Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3,* 1632.
- London Municipal Administration—Prosecutions for Corruption, *Dec. 2,* 1435.

Summerbell, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Navy
Reserve—Case of A. Rutherford, *Dec. 4,* 1759.
Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Allocation of Contracts for, *Nov. 24,* 90.
Old-Age Pensions
Poor Relief Disqualification, *Dec. 3,* 1651.
Wife of Person in receipt of Poor Relief, *Nov. 24,* 113 ; *Dec. 1,* 1258.
Southwick-on-Wear, Distress in, *Nov. 24,* 86 ; *Dec. 1,* 1241.
Trinidad
Couva Water-Rate, Memorial as to, *Nov. 24,* 97.
Immigration Ordinance (Section 70) Evasion of, alleged. *Nov. 24,* 97, 98.
White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill, *Con., Dec. 3,* 1750.

Superannuation
Appointment without Certificate, *Dec. 1,* 229, 1234.
Retiring Allowance granted, *Nov. 24,* 23, 80.

Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland)
Rules—Order in Council Presented, *Dec. 1,* 1229, 1234.

Surrey
Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. Cowan ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 25,* 374.

Sutherland, Mr. J. E. [Elgin Burghs]
Scottish Depute Sheriff Clerks, Position of *Dec. 3,* 1684.
Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill, Date of taking, *Nov. 30,* 1105.

Swansea
Education Dispute.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil ; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 25,* 402.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25,* 439–499 ; *Com., Nov. 30,* 1111, 1143 ; *Dec. 2,* 1488, 1489.
Associations, Formation of, *Dec. 2,* 1466.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2,* 1568.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
Westminster—Case of Trew, *Nov. 24,* 81.

Taxation
Assistant Surveyorships, Examinations for.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 24,* 87.
Local—Annual Returns Presented, *Nov. 30,* 1045.
Surveyors, Assistant, System of appointing.
Q. Mr. Cave ; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3,* 1652.

Telegraph Service
Accounts Presented, *Nov. 27,* 827, 935.
Betting Telegrams, Transmission of.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 25,* 397.
Messengers—Condition of placing on the Establishment.
Q. Mr. O'Grady ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 30,* 1089.
Races, Staff employed at.
Q. Mr. Cooper ; A. Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 26,* 657.

Telephone Service
Accounts Presented, *Nov. 27,* 827, 935.

Terminable Annuities
Readjustment System.
Q. Mr. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 25,* 393.

Territorial Force
See under Army.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Cattle-breeding, Funds available for improving, *Dec. 3,* 1681.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com., Dec. 1,* 1293, 1361, 1372.
Associations under, *Dec. 2,* 1465.
Mine Timber—Value of Welsh Larch, *Dec. 1,* 1255.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
Elementary Education (No. 2) Bill—Interpretation of Section 1 (2) (*b*), *Dec. 2,* 1464.
Navy
Portsmouth Lock—Wages paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason, *Nov. 30,* 1068.
Shipbuilding Contracts, Allocation of, *Dec. 3,* 1660.
Preston Mission Shelter—Case of Mr. Walsh, *Nov. 26,* 640.

Tobacco
Nicotine Fruit-tree Washes, Manufacture of.
Q. Mr. Courthope ; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 3,* 1637.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Vacant Farms Offer of for Small Holdings, *Dec. 3*, 1682, 1683.
Grindleton Churchyard Extension Proposals, *Nov. 25*, 373.
Slates—Import Statistics, *Nov. 24*, 111.

Toome
Illicit Distilling, Prosecutions for.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1691.

Tottenham Estate
Case of F. McGuinness.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 1*, 1243.

Towerhill
Cattle Drive on 7th Inst.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 684.

Trade, Board of
President.—Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill.
Parliamentary Secretary.—Sir H. E. Kearley.
Arbitration Board, Formation of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 30*, 1053.
Examination Fees for Mates, *see under* Merchant Shipping.

Trade Reports
Annual Series presented, *Nov. 26*, 537, 639
Miscellaneous Series Presented, *Nov. 25*, 280, 371.

Trade and Commerce
Welsh Statistics, Publication of.
Q. Mr. W. Roch; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 24*, 113.

Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill
Date of taking.
Qs. Mr. Sutherland, Mr. J. C. Wason: *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 30*, 1105.

Treaties
Parliamentary Control over Ratification.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Verney; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 26*, 700.

Trench Estate
Advance made to Mr. Carroll.
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 130.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.
Financial Secretary—Mr. C. E. Hobhouse.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P.—*Parliamentary Secretary Board of Education* [Yorkshire W.R., Elland]
Education Board
Circular 575, Cause for Issuing, *Nov 25*, 399, 400.
Circular 596—Wording of Paragraph 7 (*a*) *Nov. 25*, 398, 399.
Medical Officers, *Status* of, *Nov. 25*, 399.
Elementary Education (England and Wales (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*. 760–768; *Com.*, *Dec. 1*. 1334; *Dec. 2*, 1525–1528, 1531.
Associations under, *Dec. 2*, 1465, 1466.
Children in Attendance — Definition of Term, *Nov. 25*, 403.
Clause 1 (2) (*a*), Interpretation of *Nov. 26*, 678.
Clause 2—Right of Entry in Single-Room Schools, *Dec. 1*, 1261.
Clause 2 (5), Tabling of Regulations made under, *Nov. 25*, 403.
Clause 3, Interpretation of, *Dec. 2*, 1465.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1547, 1548.
Furniture of Contracting-out Schools, *Nov. 26*, 679.
Grants Payable, *Nov. 25*, 400.
Appeal against Allocation, *Dec. 2*, 1465.
Religious Instruction, Time for, *Dec. 2*, 1464.
Roman Catholic School Grant, Effect on, *Nov. 30*, 1090.
Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, Effect on, *Dec. 2*, 1461. 1462.
Section 1 (2) (*b*), Interpretation of, *Dec. 2*, 1464.
Systematic Moral Instruction, Facilities for, *Nov. 26*, 678.
Expenditure by Local Authorities, Statement as to, *Nov. 25*, 402.
Roman Catholic School Attendance, *Dec. 2*, 1463.
Swansea Education Dispute, *Nov. 25*, 402.
Teachers
Irish-Training, Recognition of, *Nov 26*, 677, 678.
Women, Statistics as to, *Nov. 26*, 677.
Walworth School Grants, *Dec. 2*, 1462.

Trinidad
Couva Water-Rate, Memorial as to.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 24*, 97.
Immigration Ordinance (Section 70) Evasion of, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 24*, 97.

Tuberculosis
Notification—Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. Vivian; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 30*, 1087.

Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill.
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1096.

Tullaroan
Postal Facilities at Gaulstown.
Qs. Mr. Meagher; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 3*, 1704.

Tweed River
Crown Fishery Leases granted.
Qs. Sir J. Jardine; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 25*, 403.

Uganda
Busoga District, Famine in — Correspondence Presented, *Nov. 24*, 22, 80.

Unemployed Workmen Act
Section (2 (3), Returns under.
Qs. Mr. Alden; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24*, 116.

Unemployment
Disfranchisement, Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Curran; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 2*, 1459.
Insurance against—Report on German system.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Dec. 2*, 1457.
Irish applications for Grants and Amount allotted.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 24*, 129.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 24*, 132.
Metropolitan Borough Employment Statistics.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 25*, 378.
Statistics—Comparison with Germany.
Qs. Earl Winterton; *As.* Sir H. Kearley, *Nov. 26*, 675.

United States
Copyright Regulations.
Qs. Sir P. Magnus; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 25*, 396.
Unemployment Statistics, Returns as to.
Q. Mr. H. P. Pease; *A.* Sir H. Kearley, *Nov. 26*, 642.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Buckinghamshire, N.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1347; *Dec. 2*, 1509.
Old-Age Pension—Case of Wife of person receiving Poor Relief, *Dec. 3*, 1649.
Port of London, Demurrage through Shallowness of River, *Dec. 3*, 1672.

Verney, Mr. F. W.—*cont.*
Ports, Use of, and Schemes for Improving (United Kingdom and Foreign Countries), *Dec. 3*, 1671.
Treaties — Parliamentary Control over Ratification, *Nov. 26*, 701; *Dec. 1*, 1238.

Verschoyle Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1441.

Vivian, Mr. H. [Birkenhead]
Business of the House, Course of, *Dec. 3*, 1709.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1729.
Tuberculosis Notification—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 30*, 1087.

Waldegrave, Earl
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 638.

Walker, Mr. H. de R. [Leicestershire, Melton]
Birstall—John Bass Charity, *Dec. 1*, 1239.

Waller Estate
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 27*, 937.

Walsall
Post Office—Clerk prosecuted for Betting.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Dec. 2*, 1460.

Walters, Mr. J. T. [Sheffield, Brightside]
Education (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 2*, 1483, 1484, 1490, 1501–1503.

Walworth
School Grants and Expenditure.
Q. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Dec. 2*, 1462.

War Office
Secretary of State—Right Hon. H. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.
Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.
Boot Contracts (1898–1902).
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Dec. 3*, 1640.
Oats Contracts, *see* Army—Horses.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
Burwell Crown Farm, Leasing of, *Nov. 24*, 84.
Stoke-on-Trent
Distress Committee, Sanction to, *Nov. 24*, 83.
Fenton Electric Supply, Loan for, *Nov. 24*, 83.

Wardle, Mr. G. J. [Stockport]
- Grays Thurrock Unemployment Distress Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1630.
- Ingatestone Election Disturbance, *Nov. 30*, 1082.
- Railway and Canal Commission, Cost and Work of, *Nov. 26*, 657.
- Railways
  - Combines—Tabling of Agreements proposed, *Nov. 26*, 673, 674.
  - Contributions by Companies to certain Associations, *Dec. 3*, 1637.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
- Canadian Immigration Laws, *Nov. 30*, 1072.
- Colonial Immigration Laws, *Nov. 24*, 96; *Nov. 30*, 1073.
- Dangerous Performances on the Stage, Prohibition of, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1083.
- Orkney
  - Copinshay Lighthouse and Fog Signal, Decision as to, *Nov. 26*, 673.
  - North Ronaldshay, Telegraph Extension to, proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1088; *Dec. 3*, 1674.
- Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill—Date of taking, *Nov. 30*, 1105.

Waterlow, Mr. D. S. [Islington, N.]
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1813.

Waterville
- Salmon Hatchery, Method of Stocking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec 3*, 1688.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
- Canadian Pacific Railway Company—Treatment of Glasgow Boilermakers, *Dec. 2*, 1452.
- Cattle
  - Breeding, Funds Available for Improving, *Dec. 3*, 1681.
  - Import Statistics, etc., *Dec. 1*, 1263.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con. Nov. 24*, 184, 200, 202.
- Education (Scotland) Bill—Deputations in connection with, *Nov. 24*, 125.
- Fever Hospitals, Inspection of, *Dec. 2*, 1460.
- Glasgow Young Men's Christian Association Classes, Position of, *Dec. 1*, 1266.
- Income-tax on Scottish Commissioners' Clerks' Pay, *Nov. 26*, 648.
- Meat Trade Combinations—Work of Committee, *Dec. 1*, 1257.
- Motor Licences Issued (1907–8), *Nov. 26*, 658.

Watt Mr. H. A.—*cont.*
- Navy
  - "Boadicea" Type Cruisers, *Dec. 3*, 1657.
  - Portsmouth Lock—Wages Paid by Messrs. Morison and Mason, *Nov. 30*, 1067.
- Old-Age Pension Regulations—Scottish Translation, *Nov. 24*, 107.
- Opium Conference—Opinions of British Delegates, *Dec. 3*, 1669.
- Parliament—Allocation of Rooms, *Dec. 3*, 1652.
- Post Office Basket Contracts, *Dec. 1*, 1260.
- Richmond Park, Nursery Garden in, *Dec. 2*, 1466.
- Scottish Sheriffs
  - Clerks Allowances to, *Dec. 2*, 1467.
  - Substitutes, Solicitors Appointed as, *Dec. 3*, 1682, 1683.

Wavertree
- Poor Law Out-relief, Premises used for Paying.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1629.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyne]
- British Indians in the Transvaal—Case of Mr. Ghandi, *Nov. 30*, 1073.
- Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1333.
- Industrial Development, Consular Reports on, *Nov. 30*, 1093, 1094.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con. Nov. 24*, 156.
- Fisheries—Scottish New Cruiser, *Dec. 1*, 1237.
- India—Simla, Boundary of Penrose Estate *Nov. 25*, 380.
- Old-Age Pension Regulations—Traslation into Gaelic proposed, *Nov. 30*, 1059.
- Rhue Rhea, Lighthouse and Fog-Signal for, *Dec. 1*, 1237.

Weir Charity
- *See under* Charities.

West Estate
- Case of P. D. Kelly.
  - *Q.* Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1094.

Westminster
- Case of Trew.
  - *Q.* Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Gladstone *Nov. 24*, 81.

Westmeath
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1439.
Police, Information as to.
Q. Sir W. Nugent; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 26*, 694.
Valuation, Cost of.
Q. Sir W. Nugent; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Dec. 4*, 1762.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Clyde Foreshores above Greenock, Valuation of, *Nov. 25*, 375.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 178.
Income-Tax—Valuation for Schedule A, *Dec. 3*, 1653.
Lighthouse Sites acquired since 1899, *Dec. 2*, 1431.
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1219, 1228.

White, Sir G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales, (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 466–476; *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1140–1144; *Dec. 2*, 1529–1531.
Financial Resolution, *Dec. 2*, 1559–1564.

White Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1646.

White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee A, *Nov. 25*, 416.
Con., *Dec. 3*, 1746.
3R.* *Dec. 3*, 1754.

Whitehead, Mr. R. [Essex, S.E.]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1802, 1803, 1809, 1827.

Whyte Blake Estate
Sale Proposals, etc.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 30*, 1100.

Wilkie, Mr. A. [Dundee]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 166.

Williams, Mr. W. L. [Carmarthen District]
Elementary Education (England and Wales (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1311–1313, 1352–1354.

Willoughby-de-Broke, Lord
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 597–601.

Willoughby-de-Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 811, 812.

Wilson, Mr. J. H. [Middlesbrough]
"Ashburton," Crew of, *Dec. 2*, 1455.
"Cartsdyke," Crew of, *Dec. 3*, 1622.
"Cereda," Crew of, *Dec. 2*, 1455.
Deck Hands—Advisory Committee Recommendation, *Dec. 2*, 1456.
"Lord Derby," Crew of, *Dec. 2*, 1456.
"Spartan Prince"—Inquiry into loss, *Dec. 3*, 1621.
"Strombus"—Deaths of Asiatics, *Dec. 2*, 1457.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 1*, 1318; *Dec. 2*, 1491.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 970–972, 979.

Wilson, Mr. W. T. [Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton]
Government Department Contracts—Wages of Carpenters, *Nov. 27*, 940.
Oxford Street—Building Accidents on Waring-White Works, *Dec. 1*, 1256.
Postmen, Auxiliary—Pay in City, *Dec. 1*, 1260.
Salvation Army, Registration of, *Nov. 27*, 939.

Wimbledon
Unemployment Grant.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Dec. 3*, 1631.

Wine
Duties—Revision proposed.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 26*, 652.

Winfrey, Mr. R. [Norfolk, S.W.]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Vacant Farms, Offer of, for Small Holdings, *Dec. 3*, 1683.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, 2R., *Dec. 3*, 1715.

Winterton, Earl [Sussex, Horsham]
Army
Inniskilling Dragoons — Promotions and Transfers, *Dec. 2*, 1450.
Territorial Force, Guns for, *Nov. 26*, 654.
Coastguard Inquiry—Proposals as to Report, *Dec. 2*, 1447.
Ingatestone Election Disturbance—Conduct of Police, etc., *Nov. 26*, 671.
Public Accounts Committee Report, Time for Discussion of, *Nov. 26*, 700.
Unemployment Statistics — Comparison with Germany, *Nov. 26*, 675, 676.

Women's Suffrage Movement
Gaskell, Mrs. Penn and Miss Smith, Case of.
Qs. Mr. G. Greenwood; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 26*, 668.
Prison Treatment.
Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 30*, 1079.

Wood, Mr. T. M.—*Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
Industrial Development, Consular Reports on, *Nov. 30*, 1074.
Roumanian Jews, Position of, *Nov. 25*, 391.
Soudan—Lado Enclave, Position in, *Nov. 30*, 1074, 1075, 1076.

Woolwich
Privilege Cabs at Arsenal Station.
Qs. Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 30*, 1078; *Dec. 3*, 1623.

Workhouses
Irish—Salaries of Teachers.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* M. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1690.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 3*, 1698.

Workington
Case of J. J. Jelly.
Qs. Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Dec. 2*, 1452; *Dec. 3*, 1627.
Unemployment Grant.
Q. Sir J. Randles; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 24*, 113.

Workmen's Compensation Act
Rules (No. 2) 1908, Presented, *Dec. 2*, 1394, 1426.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 26*, 775.
Teachers, Position of, *Dec 3*, 1677.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1781.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 30*, 1113–1117; *Dec. 2*, 1531.
Allocation of Time Resolution, *Nov. 27*, 984–987.

Wynne Estate
Hazlewood Portion, Sale of.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Dec. 2*, 1441.

York, Archbishop of
Ecclesiastical Views of Dr. Lang.
Q. Mr. McArthur; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Dec. 3*, 1705.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 24*, 185, 193, 194, 201.
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 30*, 1218, 1223, 1227.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 25*, 483–490; *Dec. 1*, 1283; *Dec. 2*, 1485–1488, 1517.
Clause 3, Interpretation of, *Dec. 2*, 1464.
Religious Instruction, Time for, *Dec. 2*, 1464.